

The AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

Vol. XLIX, No. 3

April, 1944

Arnold, Aristocracy, and America

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES*

I

ON Monday morning, October 15, 1883, the Cunarder *Servia* slowly worked its way to the dock in New York whereon Andrew Carnegie, then forty-eight years old, awaited with his secretary the disembarking of three English guests. These were Mr. and Mrs. Matthew Arnold and their daughter, Lucy. Arnold was sixty-one years old, "tall, well-formed, with an air of high breeding and refinement," though his face was "not sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," according to the reporter who "covered" his first American lecture. A Chicago paper was less generous: "He has harsh features, supercilious manners, parts his hair down the middle, wears a single eyeglass and ill-fitting clothes."¹ The aging Victorian had been transformed

*The author is professor of English and dean of the graduate school of arts and sciences in Harvard University.

¹Accounts of Arnold's American tour have been published many times. See, *inter alia*, E. P. Lawrence, "An Apostle's Progress: Matthew Arnold in America," *Philological Quarterly*, X (Jan., 1931), 62-79; James Dow McCallum, "The Apostle of Culture Meets America," *New England Quarterly*, II (July, 1929), 357-81; James Bentley Orrick, "Matthew Arnold and America," *London Mercury*, X (Aug., 1929), 389-97; Lionel Trilling, *Matthew Arnold* (New York, 1939), pp. 392 ff. Arnold's own reminiscences may be read in his *Civilization in the United States: First and Last Impressions of America* (Boston, 1888). This is a compilation of four essays printed in various periodicals in the eighties.

by success from the sprightly worldling who wrote letters full of banter to Arthur Hugh Clough into the pontifical spokesman of a cult. A series of one hundred speaking engagements awaited him, apparently arranged by Richard D'Oyley Carte, of Savoy opera fame, and Major James Burton Pond, the most notable manager of lecturing "talent" in the United States. The essayist looked forward with only a momentary qualm to the ordeal of addressing audiences in a country to which, as he had candidly written a friend, he hated to go.² He had been lecturing in England with considerable success. There had been a "crowded audience" at Cambridge in the summer of 1882 for one of the lectures he proposed to repeat in the United States; 1,200 had heard him at Liverpool the following October; and if, when he spoke before the Wordsworth Society at Westminster in the spring of 1883, the half-filled hall and listless audience reminded him of the grave, this was exceptional, some functionary had "muddled things." In his own country even "the railway porters and guides have read my books," he had been told. He had brought along plenty of letters of introduction, for he had learned that James Russell Lowell, the American minister in London, "only knows . . . Boston and Cambridge," so that Lowell's advice on social points could not "be followed for America generally." He had also brought two lectures; and the mere fact that one had already been published and the other already delivered seemed to him inconsequential, since to the one entitled "Literature and Science" he had prefixed "a new introduction, to fit it for America." A third lecture (on Emerson) was unwritten, but "a Mr. Clarence King, a charming man, tells me his mother has a villa at Newport, where I can go and be entirely free for a week, and enjoy the last of the autumn while . . . composing my Emerson."

Without delay about the baggage the Arnolds were borne off to the Windsor Hotel, where Carnegie lived with his mother, in rooms papered with tartan.³ A suite awaited them, over the doors of which floral pieces had been affixed, each inscribed with a title from one of Arnold's books—"Literature and Dogma," said one; "Culture and Anarchy," read another. "In a few minutes," as Carnegie's biographer innocently remarks, "the Arnold family found themselves completely at home." Arnold and Carnegie had first met in London in June at a dinner given by Yates Thompson, editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, when the ironmaster had urged the apostle of culture to cross the seas.

² Much of the material in this section is gleaned from *Letters of Matthew Arnold, 1848-1888*, collected and arranged by George W. E. Russell (2 vols., New York and London, 1895), II, 233 ff.

³ I follow in the main the account by Burton J. Hendrick, *Life of Andrew Carnegie* (2 vols., New York, 1932), I, 243 ff.

Although Arnold had never set foot in the United States, he had several times discussed American culture, most recently in "A Word about America," published in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1882.⁴ Writing Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff in July, he had hinted that he really knew very little about life in the republic. "One had," he said, "to trust a great deal to one's 'flair,' but I think my 'flair' served me here pretty well." He had learned that Henry James (who by 1882 was almost as ignorant of America as Arnold was), on being requested to confute the essay, confessed his inability to do so, "it was so true." A Boston paper had furnished Arnold his cue:

In towns whose names Mr. Arnold never heard, and never will hear, there will be found almost invariably a group of people of good taste, good manners, good education and of self-respect, peers of any people in the world. Such people read the best books, they interpret the best music, they are interested in themes world-wide, and they meet each other with that mutual courtesy and that self-respect which belong to men and women who are sure of their footing.

But if this was broad-minded in Boston, it was too inclusive for Arnold. That such persons might exist the essayist did not deny, but that they existed in sufficient numbers to leaven the American lump seemed to him on the whole improbable. England, he reiterated, "distributes itself" into Barbarians, Philistines, and Populace (or, less anagogically, an aristocracy, a middle class, and a proletariat), and America was "just ourselves; with the Barbarians quite left out, and the Populace nearly." (Arnold's ignorance of the labor movement and of American Populism then and always was profound.) And the American middle class, or rather the whole American nation, which was middle class, though it possessed such virtues as industriousness and religiosity, was, he firmly repeated, without culture, that is, without that "type of civilization combining all those powers which go to the building up of a truly human life—the power of intellect and knowledge, the power of beauty, the power of social life and manners, as well as the great power of conduct and religion, and the indispensable power of expansion"—Arnoldese for liberty and equality.⁵ Proof of the essential vulgarity of the Americans lay ready at hand—the observations of James Russell Lowell; the uncultivated humor of Mark Twain, whom Arnold strangely compared to Quinion, an

⁴ Collected in *Civilization in the United States*, pp. 69–108.

⁵ This definition of civilization is repeated in substance from the lecture on "Equality" which Arnold delivered before the Royal Institute in 1878 and in which he denied the existence of natural rights. "The natural right to have work found for one to do, the natural right to have food found for one to eat—rights sometimes so confidently and so indignantly asserted—seem to me quite baseless." The same address declares a little later: "Property is created and maintained by law. . . . Legal society creates, for the common good, the right of property; and for the common good that right is by legal society limitable. That property should exist, and that it should be held with a sense of security and with a power of disposal, may be taken . . . as a settled matter of expediency." Consult *Mixed Essays*, "Equality" (New York, 1879).

obscure character in the second chapter of *David Copperfield*; the description by a Miss Bird of a fearsome family of Reformed Presbyterians living in Denver,⁶ whose Sunday was "a dreadful day." Though this last example came from the fringes of civilization, "this hideousness, this *ennui*," was testimony to the presence and power of "middle-class misgrowths" in the United States he had never seen. Possibly republicans were better off without a royal family and a gentleman class, but were not the defects of American life ineradicable so long as the Americans remained what Lowell had called them, "the most common-schooled and the least cultivated people in the world"? "A higher, larger cultivation, a finer lucidity" were what they needed. Though "an institution like Harvard is probably all one could desire," nothing short of a revolution in secondary education, a turning away from vocational training toward "a serious programme," would suffice to cure New World Philistinism. That the possible perfection of Harvard was not the standard by which to measure the American popular high school, or that the provincialism of that standard might have some connection with Lowell's inability to prognosticate social conduct beyond the Hudson—these were inferences beyond the capacity of a writer who was simply following his flair.

On October 27 there was a reception in the octagonal room of the hotel, Carnegie proudly reporting to John Morley that it "combined more distinguished people than ever before assembled at one time in America." Arnold found it "magnificent" and later (in 1888) referred to Carnegie as "one of the most hospitable and generous of men," author of *Triumphant Democracy*, "a most splendid picture of American progress."⁷ He affably shook hands with the hotel steward who had arranged the flowers, and he admired the way "people, far lower down than us, live with something of the life and enjoyment of the cultivated classes." If newspapermen annoyed him from morning till night, even they, he wrote home, "are better than you would suppose, many of them English adventurers with a history." He had been given the *entrée* at the St. Nicholas Club, the Union Club, the Century Club, and the Knickerbocker Club, the last being "the smart club *par excellence*" in "a beautiful house, splendidly and luxuriantly furnished." He

⁶ Part of the Arnold legend is the remark of the bishop of Rochester that he feared Denver was not ripe for Mr. Arnold. *Letters*, II, 298.

⁷ *Civilization in the United States*, pp. 185-86. Arnold here performs a neat trick of legerdemain. "Religious people," said Carnegie's book, insisted "too much on mere material progress"—Arnold's complaint against American life—and "a friendly clergyman in Massachusetts" put into Arnold's hands a volume called *Our Country* as "a good antidote." Arnold thereupon drops the point that Carnegie's book is "too materialistic" to denounce the "entire failure" of the author of *Our Country* to avoid "self-deception." It is interesting to note that chapter XIII of *Our Country* (by the Reverend Josiah Strong, published through the American Home Missionary Society in 1885) is a glorification of Anglo-Saxon supremacy on evolutionary lines—precisely Arnold's own doctrine.

had dined with "some rich people called Shepard. She was a Miss Vanderbilt," and Vanderbilt "is said to be the richest man living, and the house was as splendid as the house of the Rothschilds." Lord Coleridge had also been a dinner guest, "most affectionate," and "his extraordinary eulogy of me" (in a speech delivered October 25) was "freely used as an advertisement for my lectures and books." Amid the flattering attention of the eminent, the diners of the rich, the life of the exclusive clubs, and the awe of German barbers, he learned without astonishment that 1,250 seats in Chickering Hall had been sold for his first lecture and that people had even paid to stand.

The ensuing catastrophe is famous in the annals of the American lyceum, the classic description being that of Major Pond:⁸

Chauncey M. Depew introduced the speaker. I was looking after the business in the front of the house. There was not a seat to be had excepting a few held by speculators on the sidewalk. As Mr. Depew and Matthew Arnold appeared before the audience, somebody told me that General and Mrs. Grant had just arrived and had seats in the gallery, but some other people were occupying them. I immediately got a policeman, and working through the standing crowd, found that they were the last two seats on the aisles in the gallery. We had no difficulty in getting the occupants to vacate as soon as they discovered who held the tickets. We had just heard the last few sentences of Mr. Depew's introduction when Matthew Arnold stepped forward, opened out his manuscript, laid it on the desk, and his lips began to move. After a few minutes General Grant said to Mrs. Grant, "Well, wife, we have paid to see the British lion; we cannot hear him roar, so we had better go home." They left the hall. A few minutes later there was a stream of people leaving the place. All those standing went away early. Later on, the others who could not endure the silence moved away as quietly as they could.

"There is," Arnold wrote his daughter in England, "a good deal to be learned as to the management of the voice, and I have set myself to learn it, though I am old to begin." When he returned to the hotel with the Carnegies, he inquired eagerly: "Well, what have you all to say? Tell me! Will I do as a lecturer?" Carnegie advised elocution lessons, but his mother displayed deeper insight. An Oxford accent had not prevented her from understanding the substance of the address. "Too meeneesterial, Mr. Arnold, too meeneesterial," was her dry comment.⁹

⁸ James Burton Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius* (New York [1900]), pp. 323-24. Other accounts vary in detail, but because of his professional interest in the performance Major Pond should be trustworthy, despite his obvious dislike of Arnold.

⁹ Arnold characteristically consoled himself for this remark by recalling a fulsome compliment from somebody else. "How very right you were," he wrote Mrs. Forster in 1884, "about what you called my too 'solemn' and poor Mr[s]. Carnegie my 'ministerial' manner in speaking. Since I have spoken so much, I have perceived that it is my great defect, inasmuch as it strikes every one. Harper's Magazine goes so far as to say that just because I am irresistibly agreeable to read, I ought never to speak." *Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold*, ed. Arnold Whitridge (New Haven, 1923), pp. 53-54.

II

The lecture which the fashionable audience could not hear was, in the words of Arnold's most penetrating biographer,¹⁰ "a curious performance." Entitled "Numbers," and made over from its original form for American consumption,¹¹ it is as pretty a little piece of antidemocratic propaganda as one can possibly find, even today. In this lecture the audience was suavely informed that the majority is always bad and usually wrong; that a popular state can survive only if it has in it a saving remnant to guide and govern it; that the remnant must know righteousness when they see it; and that the most moral people in the world are the people of Germanic stock—that is, the English. Arnold proves this remarkable fact in two ways. Modern France, he roundly says, is given over to the worship of the goddess Lubricity, whereas the English, including the English in America, are—saving a few faults, such as lack of amiability—the most serious, the most righteous, the most moral people the world has ever seen:

You are fifty millions mainly sprung, as we in England are mainly sprung, from that German stock which has faults indeed,—faults which have diminished the extent of its influence, diminished its power of attraction and the interest of its history. . . . Yet of the German stock it is, I think, true, as my father said more than fifty years ago, that it has been a stock "of the most moral races of men that the world has yet seen, with the soundest laws, the least violent passions, the fairest domestic and civil virtues." You come, therefore, of about the best parentage which a modern nation can have. Then you have had, as we in England have also had, but more entirely than we and more exclusively, the Puritan discipline. Certainly I am not blind to the faults of that discipline. Certainly I do not wish it to remain in possession of the field for ever, or too long. But as a stage and a discipline, and as a means for enabling that poor inattentive and immoral creature, man, to love and appropriate and make part of his being divine ideas, on which he could not otherwise have laid or kept hold, the discipline of Puritanism has been invaluable; and the more I read history, the more I see of mankind, the more I recognize its value. Well, then, you are not merely a multitude of fifty millions; you are fifty millions sprung from this excellent Germanic stock, having passed through this excellent Puritan discipline, and set in this enviable and unbounded country. Even supposing, therefore, that by the necessity of things your majority must in the present stage of the world probably be unsound, what a remnant, I say,—what an incomparable, all-transforming remnant,—you may fairly hope with your numbers, if things go happily, to have!

No one seems to have challenged the remarkable arithmetic whereby a national population of fifty millions was at once a "saving remnant" sprung

¹⁰ Trilling, p. 399.

¹¹ So, at least, I interpret Arnold's ambiguous statement: "I have nearly broken my heart over my first discourse, but I think it will do. It is for New York, and I have now got it in print, and nearly in the exact form in which I hope to give it" (to Mrs. Forster, Oct. 5, 1883, *Letters*, II, 253). I reprint in the text, with slight changes, a portion of my address "American Literature and the Melting Pot," *Southwest Review*, XXVI (Spring, 1941), 329-46.

from "excellent Germanic stock" and "excellent Puritan discipline" and also a vicious majority lacking "persistence" and wanting proper attention to "whatsoever things are *elevated*," so that "the failure to mind whatsoever things are elevated must impair with an inexorable fatality the life of a nation" until "the life of even these great United States must inevitably suffer and be impaired more and more, until it perish." No one apparently took the trouble to point out that half of the fifty millions were "immigrants,"¹² most of whom were not of English descent. No one seems to have inquired how, if culture has to do with the best that has been said and thought in the world, culture for Arnold and his audience was somehow left in the exclusive charge of the Anglo-Saxons. For clearly culture could not be left in charge of the Latin peoples, the chief of whom, according to Arnold, was given over to the worship of the goddess Lubricity; nor could culture be put in charge of the Catholic peoples, since, in Arnold's opinion, the discipline of Puritanism is invaluable. Consequently it was to be left in charge of the most moral race of men that the world had yet seen, with the soundest laws, the least violent passions, and the fairest domestic and civil virtues. And by some odd circumstance the representatives of the saving remnant who left sufficient impression upon the lecturer to be recorded in his letters were usually the rich, the prominent, or the well-born.

General Grant had not merely been present at Carnegie's reception, he had called later at the *Tribune* office to thank that paper for the good report of the main points of the inaudible lecture; and to General Grant, Arnold devoted a double essay in *Murray's Magazine* for January-February, 1887, designed to show that Grant revealed "a good deal of the character and qualities which we so justly respect in the Duke of Wellington." From New York Arnold went to Mr. Charles Butler at Fox Meadow, and "from him we went to the Delanos, 90 miles up the Hudson. She was a Miss Astor, and it was like staying with the Rothschilds." In Boston he was admitted to the St. Botolph and Somerset clubs, he was introduced by Oliver Wendell Holmes, he lunched with Whittier, he dined with Charles Eliot Norton, Mrs. Fields, the two daughters of Rufus Choate, Phillips Brooks, "some people called Page, friends of the Wordsworths, who have a fine house in Boston," and with various other Anglo-Saxon worthies. Hospitality in the rest of New England was likewise in the hands of the wealthy or of the right people. At Hartford he stayed with "a nice old couple called Clark"—the richest merchant in "the richest town in New England." At Newport Commodore Vanderbilt put a launch at Arnold's disposal. At Taunton he was a guest at the

¹² By 1890, out of a population of 55,000,000 about 24,500,000 were "immigrants."

house "of a Mr. Sanford, who has been Speaker of the State Assembly of Massachusetts—a rich man, and a very pretty house." At Haverhill he spent Sunday with "some people called Sanders. . . . He made a great fortune by the telephone, and has a beautiful place on a lake out there." And everywhere the essayist admired the dwelling places of the wealthy and the intellectual:

All along the Hudson it is like the rich and finished villas along the Thames by Richmond.

I thought of you at Newport . . . it is the most beautiful sea and sea walk I ever saw in my life; the wooden villas are many of them exquisite too.

[Amherst] is a pretty village near the Connecticut River, with picturesque lines of hill in the landscape. . . . At tea we had exquisite rolls, broiled oysters, and preserved peaches—nothing else—and iced water or tea to wash it down. . . . I had had a great dinner with Phillips Brooks—venison and champagne—the day before.

In the rest of the country, too, culture seemed to be always in possession of the saving remnant, *i.e.*, the richer Anglo-Saxons. For example, a letter and a telegram from General Anderson welcomed him to Richmond, where

we drove to a capital house standing alone, with a large garden behind it; here I found more black servants, and Mrs. Anderson. I was most kindly received. Virginia, of which Richmond is the capital, was colonised not by the Puritans, but by English gentry, and the liking for England and its ways, and for the better sort of English people has never failed. Mrs. Anderson has been an extremely pretty woman; her father was a great planter, who lived in an immense house in the country, with at least a hundred servants, I am told—all blacks. . . . There was a party at dinner, the cloth drawn after dinner in the old English fashion, and excellent Madeira; then we went to the lecture in a tumble-down old hall. . . . My agents were against my coming here, and said I would have no audience, but I had all the "old families," who in general do not go to lectures; one gentleman came in twenty miles on an engine to hear me.

Arnold was asked "to go down and stay at a country house near the sea to shoot duck," and at another "to shoot deer," but his schedule did not permit him to go. Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia were a glittering galaxy of first families—the Welshes, the MacVeaghs, the Whartons, the Biddles, the Henry Adams', "dear old Bancroft," and "the really best men in Congress," like Senators Bayard, Sherman, and Gibson. At Buffalo there was Mr. Milburn, the leading lawyer, an Englishman: "he is very nice [he was also attorney for the New York Central Railroad] and so is his wife." At Cleveland there was "a charming man to introduce me, Colonel John Hay, who was Lincoln's private secretary." Colonel Hay had just written a violent antilabor novel, *The Breadwinners*, which, in the words of Carl Van Doren, "made a sensation by its defense of property and the old economic order."¹⁸ At Chi-

¹⁸ *The American Novel* (rev. and enl. ed., New York, 1940), p. 197.

cago there were the Union Club, General M'Clurg, a literary society, a supper table "splendidly decorated with flowers," and courses from "oysters to ice, with plenty of champagne." In St. Louis, General Sherman, Mr. Hitchcock, "the leading lawyer here," and Mr. Chapman, "a great timber merchant," interested themselves; at Cincinnati "we passed the next day at a beautiful place in the environs, belonging to the daughter of Mr. Longworth, who was long the principal man in Cincinnati"; and, returning through Cleveland, Arnold records that Mrs. John Hay was "an immense heiress."

This kind of hospitality was to be expected, since the British lion could not hide obscurely in hotels. It is perhaps merely unfortunate that in his letters Arnold permits himself a tone of condescension, of uneasy brevity, where other races of men are concerned. He writes, for example, from New York of "the German boys who wait in the hair-cutting room and the clerks at the photographers" who "express their delight at seeing 'a great English poet,' and ask me to write in their autograph books, which they have always ready," but he hurries over this to record at length a compliment from Henry Ward Beecher. In Richmond the great English authority on education refers to schools of colored children as "dem little things," and though he finds the classes "most interesting," he merely remarks in passing that "the Andersons . . . don't yet like their being educated."¹⁴ In St. Louis, where a very small audience comprised "the best of the wealthy and cultivated people," he dismissed the rest of that polyglot metropolis in two sentences: "There is a large population descended from the French of Louisiana; their interest is in their priest. There is a large German population; their interest is in their beer-gardens and singing-halls." Indeed, there being a mere three hundred at the lecture, it was painfully obvious that the cultural level of Missouri was low, in sad contrast to that of New England, where "they have been diligent readers of my books for years," where "papa's memory" was "a living power," "the little boys were reading *Tom Brown* with delight," and "all the country places want to hear me on Literature and Science." In New England, moreover, "so many lectures were sold . . . for a fee of 150 dollars before I came . . . that I hardly know what to say."

The general American public were uneasily conscious of a practical discrepancy between the doctrine of disinterestedness and the appearance of Matthew Arnold for profit under professional lyceum management. It so

¹⁴ As I do not wish to seem to indict Arnold, it is only fair to record that in the same letter (to Mrs. Forster) he says flatly that the Negro children "are neater and better dressed than the Irish scholars in Boston," that the Negro is getting higher wages in the tobacco factories than the poor white, that he could have passed hours in the Negro schools, and that "the dirt, untidiness, and spitting" by whites in the Capitol reminded him "of all that Trollope and Dickens say." *Letters*, II, 287-88.

happened that Lily Langtry arrived in New York a day or two before Arnold for a production of the *School for Scandal*. The New York *World* chronicled this fact without comment on October 15, for newspaper minds understood the necessity a beautiful actress was under to make money. But on the same date the paper quoted an interview in which Matthew Arnold is represented as saying: "I am a poor man, and I hope that if I lecture to the Americans they will pay me enough to enable me to retire." Then, after maliciously referring the lecturer to his own words about American vulgarity, the editorial acidly concludes: "it is doubtful if sweetness will melt in his mouth." The *Chicago Tribune*, it is notorious, pictured the lecture tour as an unworthy search for "filthy lucre." Professor McCallum has dug out of the files of the *Daily Graphic* for November 15 an attack on Arnold by Kate Sanborn for peddling shopworn goods:

Do the American people generally know that Matthew Arnold charges one hundred and fifty dollars¹⁵ per hour for mumbling and stumbling over his printed article on *Literature and Science*, which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* of August, 1882? We are all willing to pay a dollar to see the man for what he has accomplished and as the son of the noble Rugby master, but isn't it a little cool and cheeky to presume on our ignorance of English magazines?—One of our professors, who spent the whole afternoon before the lecture in carefully reading this article that he might be ready for further information, felt that he had been the victim of a fraud. My "sense of conduct" and my "sense of beauty" were jarred, I confess. As a reader he is a sad failure. He cannot be heard. It must be that he has come to fill his pensioned pockets¹⁶ by showing himself to reverent and admiring crowds. Badly as we need "lucidity," we cannot be helped by his utterances. He does not equal Emerson either in thought or expression.—Are we not entitled to something as yet unpublished when we hear a "lecture"?¹⁷

At the end of his engagements the New York *Tribune* remarked with heavy irony that Arnold was returning home with "\$6000 of the Philistines' money in his pockets." And although the magazines which chiefly circulated among the intellectual classes were not unfriendly, the newspapers—organs of the plain people—pursued the essayist throughout his travels with inimical comment or malicious anecdote.¹⁸

¹⁵ It is not clear from Arnold's *Letters* (II, 276) whether \$150 was exceptional or standard for his appearance.

¹⁶ Just before coming to America Arnold had, after a good deal of hesitation, accepted Gladstone's offer of an annual pension of £250. See Trilling, p. 392.

¹⁷ *New England Quar.*, II, 368.

¹⁸ There is at Yale an unpublished dissertation dealing with American comment on Arnold, which I have not seen. In his *Matthew Arnold's "Sweetness and Light" in America, 1848-1938*, Mr. Seymour Gorden Link says he could find no sectional difference in the newspaper attacks on the author. Even the New England journalists "fairly outdid themselves in poking fun and abuse at the distinguished visitor," and the papers of the Middle West proved the truth of everything Arnold said. (Nashville, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1938. This is an abstract of Mr. Link's thesis.)

III

Charges of incompetence and commercialism form a journalistic *argument ad hominem* inevitable in the situation but actually irrelevant to the basic problem presented by Arnold's ideas. Likewise the easy assertion by editors that American culture was at least no worse than British culture, since Philistinism is a universal trait, was equally facile and equally irrelevant. What the defenders of the democratic culture were really confronting, had they but known it, was a much more fundamental, a much more troublesome, attack, but only Whitman, in his rude colloquial way, phrased the danger precisely. People like Matthew Arnold, he told Traubel in 1888, "make more fuss over foliage than root." "I do not feel myself to be against him in any way," he went on to remark, "but so much is made of the Arnold type of man that we are liable to miss our normal guage of value." Whitman later expanded this judgment: "The vitiating fact is—the bother of it all is—that men of the Matthew Arnold type dominating contemporary literature judge all men (not literary men alone but all men) by bookish standards." Arnold, he said, "I can never realize . . . we are constitutionally antipathetic: Arnold is porcelain, chinaware, hangings." And with a sardonic richness which only Americans can comprehend Traubel records on a later day concerning Arnold: "It is a great comfort for me to think that the Lord finds a place for them all: and if the Lord can afford to do so, so can we—and not stand off and be critical. We must have the bedbug, the rat, the flea: they all have their places."¹⁹ "I must insist upon the masses, Tom," he told T. B. Harned, "they are our best, they are preservative: I insist upon their integrity as a whole—not, of course, denying or excusing what is bad. Arnold is all wrong on that point: *it is good, not bad, that is common*" (my italics).²⁰

The sensitivity of the poet had discovered what irritated newspapermen had sensed but vaguely; namely, a working interrelation between the Arnoldian doctrine of culture and the Arnoldian belief in racial snobbery and anti-democratic political action.²¹ He had said, to be sure, that England needed

¹⁹ Horace Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden* (3 vols., New York, 1914-15), I, 95-96, 209; II, 391; III, 121. Even more colloquial is the judgment (III, 400): "my worst criticism would be, that Arnold brings coals to Newcastle—that he brings to the world what the world already has a surfeit of: is rich, hefted, lousy, reeking with delicacy, refinement, elegance, prettiness, propriety, criticism, analysis: *all of them things which threaten to overwhelm us*" (my italics). And, a little later: "Vellum? pshaw! hangings, curtains, finger-bowls, chinaware, Matthew Arnold!" (III, 532).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 175; cf. p. 232. "Arnold always gives you the notion that he hates to touch the dirt—the dirt is so dirty! But everything comes out of the dirt—everything: everything comes out of the people, the everyday people, the people as you find them and leave them: not university people, not F. F. V. people: people, people, just people!"

²¹ The tendency to see Arnold as all of a piece, arising from the failure to differentiate his social theory before the Second Reform Bill from the reactionary views he expressed in the eighties, vitiates most of the interpretative studies. Students of Arnold have also in the main

more quality rather than less; that culture is the study of perfection; and that culture "seeks to do away with classes; to make the best that has been thought and known in the world current," but the doing away with classes proves not to mean what it seems to mean. Though he had written that "France has organised democracy with a certain indisputable grandeur and success," that was in the sixties; in the eighties he published a succession of pessimistic estimates of democratic government.²² After denying again in 1880, as he had formerly denied, the doctrine of natural rights,²³ he pictured a possible "last scene in the wonderful career of Lord Beaconsfield," in which that octogenarian, in a field-marshal's uniform, enters the house of commons and commands the speaker to "take away that bauble," the mace. In 1886 he wrote that there was little hope in the "Parliamentary mind," that Gladstone was a "mere parliamentarian," and that "the danger of our situation is so grave that it can hardly be exaggerated." In 1887 he said that "parliaments, parties, and politicians, are more or less discredited," that "plain reasonable people throughout the country" look upon the house of commons "with ever deepening disgust and shame," and that "it is a relief to them when Parliament is not sitting; they are uneasy and apprehensive as soon as it meets again, for they know that the time for humiliation has returned." In his penultimate article he wrote that "long ago the country had made up its mind that to pretend 'discussion' to be the object of such debates as those which have gone on in the House of Commons during the last few years was an absurdity," expressed pleasure in the adoption of a stringent cloture rule, and argued that "dangerous expressions" ought to be suppressed by force. In his last article he pictured democracy as "feather-brained" because it thinks "restraint a curse, and doing as one likes the height of felicity" ("The Americans in general think so too"), prophesied inevitable riots, "roughs, drink, fires, and bloodshed" in England unless there was radical political change, called Gladstone a "stump orator" whose "powers of self-

failed to study the changes of text between the first appearance of an essay or lecture in the magazines and its later appearance in volume form, and they have signally failed to study the uncollected essays. In his *Victorian Critics of Democracy* (Minneapolis, 1938) Mr. Benjamin Evans Lippincott gives a full analytical view of an orthodox sort (pp. 93-133) but fails to realize how deeply the Hyde Park "riots" and the Franco-Prussian War affected Arnold. The only genetic study of Arnold's political development that has weight seems to be Otto Elias, *Matthew Arnolds politische Grundanschauungen* (Palaestra, No. 175) (Leipzig, 1931).

²² "The Future of Liberalism," *Nineteenth Century*, VIII (July, 1880), 1-18, collected in *Irish Essays*; "Numbers" (already discussed); "The Nadir of Liberalism," *Nineteenth Century*, XIX (May, 1886), 645-63; "The Zenith of Conservatism," *ibid.*, XXI (Jan., 1887), 148-64; "Up to Easter," *ibid.*, XXI (May, 1887), 629-43; "From Easter to August," *ibid.*, XXII (Sept., 1887), 310-24.

²³ "Not that there is . . . any natural right in every man to the possession of a vote, or any gift of wisdom and virtue conferred by such possession." "The Future of Liberalism," *Works*, XI, 140.

deception are so inexhaustible that he is never insincere," and charged him with stirring up class hatreds. The fact that Arnold had the Fenian movement under his eyes does not alter the destructive character of comments like these.²⁴ In contrast to either Gladstone or Disraeli he set up Bismarck as his model statesman because

those legitimate needs and that security of Germany, which thirty years ago seemed unattainable for her, he has attained. Germany, which thirty years ago was hampered, weak, and in low esteem, is now esteemed, strong, and with her powers all at command. It was a great object and the great *Reichskanzler* has attained it.²⁵

The smooth surface of the doctrine of "culture" has drawn attention away from the deep distrust of the people upon which it rests. Neither the aristocracy, the middle class, nor the proletariat is fit to govern England, three categories which practically exhaust the population of Great Britain, except for a saving remnant; yet by the eighties this remnant has mysteriously grown into a body of "plain, reasonable people" who, standing outside of political action, are somehow to prevent the state from becoming a "feather-brained democracy!" Like Lindbergh, Arnold in his later years pretended to be outside politics, said that he disliked political subjects, and hinted mysteriously that he was speaking, he hoped (or feared), for the last time.²⁶ His equalitarianism is purely theoretic: the magazine version of *Culture and Anarchy* was, except for the first part (an Oxford Lecture), originally entitled *Anarchy and Authority*, Arnold being heavily enlisted on the side of authority, as a passage omitted from all but the first versions of the work amply testifies:

²⁴ "We had the obstructed and paralysed House of Commons. Then, finally came the news one morning of the London street-mobs and street-riots, heightening yet further the impression of our impotence and disarray. The recent trial and acquittal of the mob-orators will probably complete it." "I agree, too, that the House of Commons is a scandal, and Ireland a crying danger. I agree that monster processions and monster meetings in the public streets and parks are the letting out of anarchy, and that our weak dealing with them is deplorable." "The Nadir of Liberalism," *Nineteenth Century*, XIX, 646, 647.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, XIX, 649. In 1865 he had been torn between his disgust with the lack of aristocratic refinement in Germany, where the "whole middle class hates refinement and disbelieves in it," and his admiration for "Bismarck's audacity, resolution, and success," in contrast to Palmerston. Most of the English, he then thought, were about on Palmerston's level. *Letters*, I, 354, 356. Arnold early expressed an enthusiastic admiration for the "clearness and width of view," the "energy and precision of Napoleon III." *Ibid.*, I, 11-12.

²⁶ The openings of the late uncollected essays are all in this tone; e.g., in "Up to Easter" he says it is only his desire to be useful that brings him into politics, that he knows "the impatience and irritation which my intervention in these matters causes to many people. Nothing I should like better than to feel assured that I should never have occasion to write a line on politics again." Politics are "a mass of insincerity, of phrase, fiction, and claptrap, which can impose, one would think, on no plain reasonable man outside of politics," and thousands of plain, reasonable people "want nothing for themselves in politics" and "only demand that the politician shall not bring the country into danger and disaster." *Nineteenth Century*, XXI, 629-30. The identification of all political action with chicanery and the creation of a bloc theoretically "non-political," of which Arnold is the spokesman, is a familiar device in propaganda directed against democratic processes.

With me, indeed, this rule of conduct is hereditary. I remember my father, in one of his unpublished letters, written more than forty years ago, when the political and social state of the country was gloomy and troubled and there were riots in many places, goes on, after strongly insisting on the badness and foolishness of the government, and on the harm and dangerousness of our feudal and aristocratical constitution of society, and ends thus: "As for rioting, the old Roman way of dealing with that is always the right one; flog the rank and file, and fling the ringleaders from the Tarpeian Rock!" And this opinion we can never forsake.²⁷

The occasion of the famous essay was the very mild rioting in Hyde Park, consequent upon the first defeat of the Second Reform Bill; Arnold then, as always, inferred the direst consequences from mob actions.²⁸ In 1859 he had joined the Queen's Westminster Rifles because he thought the nation was in need of control by force;²⁹ he thought "the great States of the Continent have two great elements of cohesion" lacking in England, "their administrative system and . . . their army";³⁰ while lamenting the breakdown of parliamentary government in the eighties, he dwelt also upon the dangers of "Jacobinism":

It is small, but it is active and visible. It is a sinister apparition. We know its works from having seen them so abundantly in France; it has the temper of hatred and the aim of destruction. There are two varieties of Jacobin, the hysterical Jacobin, and the pedantic Jacobin; we possess both, and both are dangerous.³¹

And he alternated between denouncing the brutality and violence of labor and flattering the English peasantry as being more "patient, faithful, respectful, kindly" than any other peasantry whatsoever.³² The Irish peasantry, however, not being respectful or kindly were to be controlled by force,³³ and the Conservative government was encouraged to suppress freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press in Ireland.³⁴

²⁷ *Cornhill Magazine*, XVIII (Aug., 1868), 250. In *Culture and Anarchy* this is omitted, and one reads: "without order there can be no society, and without society there can be no human perfection. And this opinion we can never forsake, etc."

²⁸ The *Letters* are illuminating. See the accounts in I, 389-90 and 438.

²⁹ "... it seems to me that the establishment of these Rifle Corps will more than ever throw the power into the hands of the upper and middle classes, and these classes will thus have over the lower classes the superiority, not only of wealth and intelligence, which they have now, but of physical force." *Letters*, I, 126.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 440.

³¹ *Nineteenth Century*, XIX, 654.

³² On the frequency with which Arnold identifies the working class with brutality and violence see Lippincott, *op. cit.* The passage on the English peasantry is in the *Nineteenth Century*, XIX, 653.

³³ Arnold perpetually insists on one law for both England and Ireland and on the enforcement of this law by administrative action. Force bills directed against Ireland had his entire support; and he wrote explicitly: "In general, administrative action is what is now required against anarchy in Ireland, *not recourse to proceedings at law*" (my italics). *Ibid.*, XXI, 159; and though he said it was the duty of government to cure injustice, let us never "approve of its leaving the other part of its duty, the quelling of anarchy, undone" (p. 160).

³⁴ "There are surely some kinds of speeches, some kinds of meetings, some kinds of newspaper-writing, which in the present circumstances of Ireland should not be permitted there and should be stopped." *Ibid.*, XXI, 159.

IV

There was, to be sure, a kindly and likable side to Arnold, whose views of education were extraordinarily philosophic, who set his face against the laissez-faire economic philosophy of the middle class, who saw the absurdity and narrowness of many Protestant sects, and whose theory of culture, in its broader aspects, is both useful and comprehensive. But a man to whom utterances like the foregoing easily came was essentially a Hamiltonian, whose character, perceptions, and sympathies fitted in easily with that of the dominant groups in the United States. He was never tired of quoting Charles Sumner's statement that what had particularly struck him in England was the large class of gentlemen as distinct from the nobility, gentlemen of "serious knowledge, high accomplishment, and refined taste." With these gentlemen England abounded; and in view of Arnold's assertions that the English nobility was politically bankrupt, that an aristocratic society in the broadest sense is the most desirable society, and that a "high standard of civilisation" can therefore be maintained only by the gentlemen class, the implication was irresistible: standards of civilization in the United States could be maintained only by gentlemen. Whoever the American gentleman might be, it was clear who he was not—he was not a member of the great, dreary middle class but a spirit sufficiently delicate and rare to appreciate Arnold's statement: "in America, perhaps, we see the disadvantage of having a social equality before there has been any such high standard of social life and manners formed."³⁵ And that the gentleman must perforce spring from Anglo-Saxon stock was an inference to be drawn from the unfortunate spread of amoral equalitarianism in France:

The sense in France for the power of conduct has not greatly deepened. . . . The sense for the power of intellect and knowledge had not been adequate either. The sense for beauty has not been adequate. Intelligence and beauty have been, in general, but so far reached, as they can be and are reached by men, who, of the elements of perfect humanisation, lay thorough hold upon one only,—the power of social intercourse and manners. . . . Well then, if a nation laying no sufficient hold upon the powers of beauty and knowledge, and a most failing and feeble hold upon the power of conduct, comes to demoralisation and intellectual stoppage and fearful troubles, we need not be inordinately surprised.³⁶

The inference was driven home by a significant paragraph in the essay on "Democracy," which was originally the preface to Arnold's report on French schools:

The greatest men of America, her Washingtons, Hamiltons, Madisons, well understanding that aristocratical institutions are not in all times and places possible;

³⁵ "Equality," *Works*, X, 65.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, X, 72.

well perceiving that in their Republic there was no place for these; comprehending, therefore, that from these that security for national dignity and greatness, an ideal commanding popular reverence, was not to be obtained, but knowing that this ideal was indispensable, would have been rejoiced to found a substitute for it in the dignity and authority of the State. They deplored the weakness and insignificance of the executive power as a calamity. When the inevitable course of events has made our self-government something really like that of America, when it has removed or weakened that security for national dignity, which we possessed in *aristocracy*, will the substitute of the *State* be equally wanting to us? If it is, then the dangers of America will really be ours; the dangers which come from the multitude being in power, with no adequate ideal to elevate or guide the multitude.³⁷

Franklin and Jefferson are absent from this list; and it is significant that in a sentence later added to the essay, Arnold uses the word "Americanise" in a pejorative sense:

On what action may we rely to replace, for some time at any rate, that action of the aristocracy upon the people of this country, which we have seen exercise an influence in many respects elevating and beneficial, but which is rapidly, and from inevitable causes, ceasing? In other words, and to use a short and significant modern expression which everyone understands, what influence may help us to prevent the English people from becoming, with the growth of democracy, *Americanised*? On the action of the State.³⁸

"Americanisation" was something opposed to culture, but the American gentleman could neatly sidestep the implicit dilemma by adopting upon Arnold's recommendation two contradictory theories: he was to avoid the contamination of "democratic" action, especially political action, if he possibly could; and yet he was to put his faith in a mysteriously perfected "state" action—presumably action by gentlemen for gentlemen without reference to "the growth of democracy." It is not without meaning that Arnold described the old, un-reformed American Senate as "perhaps, of all the institutions of that country, the most happily devised, the most successful in its working."³⁹ The Senate which thus aroused Arnold's enthusiasm has been less enthusiastically called the most exclusive rich men's club in the world.

Waited upon by lesser races,⁴⁰ secure in the faith that wealth "is conceived as a thing which almost any American may attain, and which almost every American will use respectably," the American gentleman might also

³⁷ *Ibid.*, X, 25-26.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, X, 22-23. Dr. Elias notes that the passage first appeared in 1861 in the introduction to "Popular Education of France" but fails to notice the illuminating fact that the sentence about being "Americanised" was added some twenty years later. Cf. also p. 38, where one reads that if the middle class do not adopt state education, they will "Americanise" England; i.e., "rule it by their energy, but . . . deteriorate it by their low ideals and want of culture."

³⁹ *Civilization in the United States*, p. 143 ("A Word More about America").

⁴⁰ "Their domestic service is done for them by Irish, Germans, Swedes, negroes." *Ibid.*, p. 120.

take pride in the fact that in one respect he was ahead of his English brethren. He did not live in a country where it was necessary to introduce a bill "to prevent the land of a man who dies intestate from going, as it goes now, to his eldest son," a custom giving the "almost exclusive possession of the land of this country" to the Barbarians.⁴¹ Secure therefore in his easy economic righteousness, he could refrain from meddling with "machinery," serenely trusting a "best self" which would mysteriously unite him with other gentlemen, reading in Arnold that "We are in no peril from giving authority to this, because it is the truest friend we all of us can have; and when anarchy is a danger to us, to this authority we may turn with sure trust."

For this "best self," it seems, "inspires faith, and is capable of affording a serious principle of authority," as the Duke of Wellington prophetically saw. Remote from the meaninglessness of political life, the American gentleman could discover in this undefined "best self" a union with other Hamiltonians:

So whatever brings risk of tumult and disorder, multitudinous processions in the streets of our crowded towns, multitudinous meetings in their public places and parks,—demonstrations perfectly unnecessary in the present course of affairs,—our best self, or right reason, plainly enjoins us to set our faces against. It enjoins us to encourage and uphold the occupants of the executive power, whoever they may be, in firmly prohibiting them. But it does this clearly and resolutely, and is thus a real principle of authority, because it does it with a free conscience; because in thus provisionally strengthening the executive power, it knows that it . . . is establishing *the State*, or organ of our collective best self, of our national right reasons.⁴²

And in the Newport villas and the clubs gentlemen could congratulate themselves on having an authoritative word in their favor: "Certainly equality will never of itself alone give us a perfect civilisation."⁴³ Did they perhaps also agree that Grant "had governing instincts"?⁴⁴

Harvard University

⁴¹ See the section on "Our Liberal Practitioners" in *Culture and Anarchy*.

⁴² The reader is entreated to consider the whole argument of "Doing as One Likes" in *ibid.*

⁴³ *Works*, X, 91. The fact that the next sentence says that British inequality will not produce a perfect civilisation simply flatters American vanity.

⁴⁴ *Civilization in the United States*, p. 43. Arnold says that Grant admired the South "for the boldness with which they silenced all opposition and all croaking by press or by individuals within their control."

Theodoric vs. Boethius: Vindication and Apology¹

WILLIAM BARK*

THE background of the tragedy which cut short the brilliant career of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius has always remained obscure and puzzling. This talented scion of one of the noblest of Roman families rose to positions of the greatest eminence under Theodoric the Ostrogoth. In 522 his two young sons shared the consulship and Boethius pronounced the panegyric in praise of the king. Later in the year he was signally honored by appointment as Master of the Offices. Then disaster struck. Albinus the consular was accused of treason; Boethius defended him, only to be himself accused, arrested, and, in 524 or 525, executed.² The obvious sources of information concerning the background of the case are meager. The best one, Boethius' tantalizing defense written in prison, hints vaguely but tells little.³ He was charged with treason along with Albinus and also with sacrilege, whereas in reality, he maintains, he was defending the whole senate against the accusation of treason.⁴ Although his brief statement, that he was censured for obstructing evidence concerning the senate's guilt, has led to much speculation, the vitally important theological evidence has received insufficient attention.⁵ It now seems possible that this heretofore neglected source of in-

*The author took his doctor's degree at Cornell University in 1936. He is now associate professor of history in Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin.

¹I wish to express my thanks for aid given me through the Stanford University committee of the Social Sciences Research Council. By this means, while working on a related subject, I was able to gather a large part of the material used in this study.

²For an eloquent account of the whole case stated at some length see Thomas Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders* (2d ed., Oxford, 1896), III, 481-98. In the matter of dating, Charles H. Coster, *The Iudicium Quinquvirale* (Cambridge, 1935), passed over Hermann Usener's *Anecdota Holderi* and consequently went astray. See M. L. W. Laistner's review, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLII, 284-85.

³*Philosophiae Consolatio*, I. iv. 142-58, in the edition of Edward K. Rand and Hugh F. Stewart in the Loeb series (New York, 1918). All references to the works of Boethius are to this edition. The evidence of Agnellus' *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis*, the *Liber Pontificalis*, the *Anonymus Valesianus*, Procopius, and Cassiodorus has been recently re-examined by Coster, particularly pp. 43-63 and notes. Boethius' own account of what took place, to which he refers in his defense (*Phil. Consol.*, I. iv. 86-88), regrettably has never come to light.

⁴*Ibid.*, I. iv. 48-154.

⁵Contributions to the subject are indeed assuming mountainous proportions. It is not my intention in this brief article to review the older writers, who were altogether or largely unaware of the true importance of the theological side of the affair. Coster has gone over the arguments of such writers as Cessi, Sundwall, Hartmann, and Bury exhaustively. For other views see Viktor Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der "skythischen Kontroversen"* (Paderborn, 1935). Note also E. K. Rand's chapter on Boethius in *Founders of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1928) and his briefer references in *The Building of Eternal Rome* (Cambridge,

formation may clear up the mystery of Boethius' downfall, as it is the purpose of this paper to show.

It has always been recognized that the history of the Patristic Age cannot be understood apart from the theological controversies which raged continuously for centuries and eventually led to a separation of the churches of East and West.⁶ In the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries of the Christian era doctrinal disputes were matters of the greatest interest and importance not merely to theologians but even to the man in the street. And the fate of many a ruler was sharply influenced by his theological views. In the Greek East, where the passion for subtle distinctions of dogma was particularly strong, the most violent battles were waged over the abstruse but highly significant subjects of the Trinity and the person and nature of Christ.

In the fifth century there arose two Christological heresies which threw the whole Orient into turmoil, eventually drew in even the bishop of Rome, and in the next century threatened Justinian's entire imperial policy. The heresiarch Nestorius, archbishop of Constantinople, agreed with the orthodox dogma in confessing two natures in Jesus Christ but taught that he also had two persons. Monophysitism, which was introduced in the Eastern capital by the archimandrite Eutyches, taught correctly that Christ had just one person but then heretically insisted that he had only one nature. The Monophysites were especially strong in Alexandria, whence Eutyches' chief support had come, but they won adherents everywhere and finally threatened to disrupt dangerously the unity of the East, calling all who opposed them Nestorians and rejecting with special violence the oecumenical Council of Chalcedon, which they regarded as too sympathetic to the Nestorians. In a well-meant effort to restore internal peace, the Emperor Zeno along with Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, in 482 gave his support to a compromise known as the Henoticon, which it was hoped would reconcile the dissident factions.

The Henoticon miscarried. Not only did it fail to establish unity in the East, but, by passing over the decrees of Chalcedon in silence, it also gave affront to the papacy. As a consequence Felix III excommunicated Acacius, thus precipitating the Acacian schism (484-519). This meant that when the

1943), especially pp. 237-39. See also his review of Schurr's book, *Speculum*, XI (1936), 153-56. The work of H. F. Stewart, *Boethius, an Essay* (Edinburgh and London, 1891), has now been superseded in many respects by later contributions.

⁶ For a full and scholarly treatment of the events quickly sketched in the following paragraphs the reader is referred to these standard works: Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, II (Paris, 1908); Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft* (2 vols., Tübingen, 1930-33); Louis Duchesne, *L'histoire ancienne de l'église*, III (Paris, 1911), and *L'église au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1925); Adolf von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II-III (Freiburg i.B., 1888, 1890).

successors of Zeno, Anastasius I (491-518), Justin I (518-27), and the famous nephew of the latter, Justinian (527-65), attempted to bring the West back into their orbit, they had first to come to an agreement with Rome. No less important of course was the restoration of ecclesiastical harmony in the Orient. The diplomacy of Justinian, who directed the Byzantine foreign policy long before he became emperor, is particularly important for the present study. Justinian at last found in the theological formula of a group of Latin-speaking monks residing in Scythia Minor what he considered a solution to his problem. These Scythian monks, who defended their position with violence and oburgation, instigated the Theopaschite controversy (thus named because the Scythian formula maintained that "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh"), and with this dispute and the accompanying imperial diplomacy Boethius was closely connected, as will appear.

The way to an understanding of Boethius' position in respect of Byzantine policy and the reasons for his fall from Theodoric's grace was prepared by the discovery that he was an accomplished theologian as well as a philosopher, scientist, and statesman.⁷ The acceptance of the theological tractates as authentic made certain very significant conclusions inevitable. Before the Cassiodorus fragment came to light, it had been easy to believe that a pagan Boethius could look on unmoved while orthodox emperors tried to wrest Italy from the Arian Theodoric. But that discovery showed the Boethius who served Theodoric as Master of Offices also serving the cause of orthodoxy in Rome, which altered the situation considerably.

In the sixth century political affairs were often inseparably bound up with matters of religion, and it has been recognized for some time that the arraignment of Boethius, the Catholic theologian, had theological as well as political aspects.⁸ But precisely how Boethius was linked with the confused Roman-Byzantine negotiations has not been clear. Now, however, Father Schurr, by means of his intensive study of Boethius' Trinitarian doctrine, has demonstrated that Boethius took an active interest in doctrinal disputes of the great-

⁷ Recognition of this exceedingly important fact began in 1877 with Hermann Usener's publication of the *Anecdota Holderi*, a fragment of Cassiodorus discovered by Alfred Holder, which stated that Boethius wrote a treatise on the Trinity, some doctrinal tractates, and a treatise against Nestorius. Coster's neglect of this work led him to state, in note 214, "It is quite possible that Boethius was not in fact the author of many of the theological works which have been attributed to him." This view is no longer tenable. Professor E. K. Rand has long upheld the authenticity of the theological works, even the disputed fourth tractate, which he once questioned. In Rand's acceptance of all five treatises H. F. Stewart concurs; see their discussion in the introduction of their edition, pp. xi and 52. See also Rand, *Founders*, pp. 149-57, 315, n. 28, and Rand, *Building of Eternal Rome*, p. 239, n. 104. Father Schurr accepts four of the tractates as unquestionably genuine but still rejects Tr. IV (Schurr, pp. 6-9). Cf. Rand's comment, *Speculum*, XI, 153-54. In any case the status of Tr. IV does not alter the fact that Boethius was a distinguished theologian.

⁸ Rand, *Founders*, pp. 322-23, n. 75.

est political importance. Apparently Boethius started out innocently enough in 512, intervening in a matter which at the time appeared to have no vast significance. In that year certain bishops of the Eastern European provinces of the Byzantine Empire appealed to Pope Symmachus. Caught between Eutychians and Nestorians, they asked for the pope's advice and presented their Christological formula, *et ex et in duabus naturis*, as a safe guide to orthodoxy.⁹ The pope gave the bishops only the theologically sound but unsympathetic advice that they should renounce communion with the successors of the heretical Acacius of Constantinople, even if it meant martyrdom.¹⁰ Boethius treated the Easterners more kindly; after careful study of their theology, he concluded that they pointed the way to a clear understanding of the Christological problem at issue.¹¹ In his *Liber contra Eutychen et Nestorium*, one of the first notable contributions to scholastic studies, he brilliantly defended their position, thus for the first time engaging in a dispute in which the Scythian monks figured.¹²

Before Boethius was to return to the subject of theology, certain important developments, including and following the settlement of the Acacian schism, were to take place. Guided by his astute nephew Justinian, Justin I succeeded in healing the breach where his predecessor, Anastasius I, had failed. Late in March, 519, the delegates of Pope Hormisdas, come to settle the long dispute, were led into Constantinople by Justinian and Vitalian, the Master of Soldiers.¹³ The presence of Justinian is noteworthy, for from the first he devoted himself to the ecclesiastical problems facing the empire he was to rule, even engaging actively in doctrinal controversy. His chief purpose was to put an end to the dangerous theological dissension which rent the empire, since there could be no thought of political unification until the Eastern church had made its peace with Rome.¹⁴ And at the same time some com-

⁹ Schurr, pp. 108, 124-27. The bishops' letter is no. 12 in Thiel, and Symmachus' answer is no. 13. The Eastern provinces included Scythia, where the famous Scythian monks must already have become active. Boethius' course at this time could not have been thought dangerous by Theodoric, if indeed the king was aware of it at all.

¹⁰ For the background see Schurr, pp. 108-36, and Peter Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491-518* (Madison, 1939), pp. 13-50.

¹¹ As he indicates in the preface of Tr. V.

¹² Note that this tractate, No. V, was chronologically the earliest, Schurr, p. 127. For Boethius as the first of the scholastics, see Rand, *Founders*, pp. 150, 152, 155-56.

¹³ *Collectio Avellana*, no. 167, in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 35, edited by Otto Günther; hereafter cited as *Col. Avell.* See also Henricus de Noris, *Dissertatio I. In Historiam Controversiae de Uno ex Trinitate Passo*, in *Opera Omnia* (Verona, 1729), III, 790-91; hereafter cited as de Noris, *Dis. I.* Vitalian had tried in vain to force Anastasius I to come to an understanding with the pope (Schurr, pp. 127-36, and Charanis, pp. 51-71). Vitalian, who was a Goth, came from Scythia and was related to Leontius, one of the Scythian monks (*Col. Avell.*, p. 216).

¹⁴ See Pierre Batiffol, "L'empereur Justinien et le siège apostolique," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XXVI (Paris, 1916), 193-264, and also Friedrich Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz und*

promise satisfactory to the dissident religious groups in the Orient, particularly the large body friendly to Monophysitism, had to be found. In March, 519, then, Justinian looked hopefully forward to the solution of some of these problems in the conclusion of the Acacian schism and the winning of papal approval.

It is at this point that the Scythian monks, led by John Maxentius, a disputant as ardent as he was skillful, appear upon the scene. Our best source, though a prejudiced one, is the deacon Dioscorus, a member of the papal delegation and an intimate and influential friend of Pope Hormisdas.¹⁵ Of Maxentius and the other monks Dioscorus had nothing good to say; he claimed indeed that they made trouble for all concerned—the papal representatives, the emperor, the patriarch, their patron Vitalian, and Justinian—and held up the work of peacemaking. They particularly desired that their Theopaschite formula, *unus ex trinitate passus carne*, be accepted, and when rebuffed, they fled to Rome, hoping to win the approval of the pope himself for their views.¹⁶

The attitude of Justinian during the negotiations which began in March is especially interesting. As late as the end of June, 519, he agreed with the papal legates in regarding the monks as an obstacle to the settlement of the Acacian schism.¹⁷ But his sentiments had changed only a few days later and he then and thereafter adopted a very friendly tone in referring to the monks. In a letter to Hormisdas, Justinian explained his new position in language carefully veiled but quite intelligible.¹⁸ A great dispute had arisen in the East and apparently Justinian had now become convinced that the peace of the church could best be salvaged through the Scythian formula.¹⁹ Hence he urged Hormisdas to give the monks the approval which had been denied them by the papal delegates in the East. What had happened there is clear enough. Constantinople was willing to make peace at the expense of Acacius and the adherents of the Henoticon, but the party of Monophysite sympathies proved too strong. Rome insisted upon the recognition of Chalcedon, but the

die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche. Erstes Buch: Das Leben und die polemischen Werke des Leontius von Byzanz. In Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Band III, Hefte 1 und 2 (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 304, 315-16.

¹⁵ For his private reports see the *Col. Avel.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 216, dated June 29, 519. See also nos. 217, 224, and de Noris, *Dis. I*, pp. 798-99. The legates refused even to receive the *Libellus fidei*, which Maxentius wrote in behalf of his brothers. Hormisdas accepted it, however, and it was also presented to the bishops, church, and Senate in Rome.

¹⁷ As he shows in a severely critical letter to Hormisdas, which Günther dates June 29, 519, *Col. Avel.*, no. 187.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 191. See Schurr's comments, pp. 157-58, n. 184.

¹⁹ And that is of course the policy he adopted and put into effect at the fifth oecumenical council in 553. See also Loofs, pp. 315-16, and Schurr, pp. 152-54.

Monophysite party was willing to accept the decrees of that council only if they were properly interpreted, *i.e.*, against Nestorianism. Since the Scythians offered a solution which would make Chalcedon acceptable to the East, their formula was exactly what Justinian needed. No wonder he urged the pope to treat the monks well.²⁰

The pope remained aloof, however, and the monks unsatisfied, though not silent. They actually—and this, too, is significant—presented their case both to the people and to the senate in Rome, much to the pope's annoyance.²¹ Moreover, while still waiting for papal approval they wrote to the African bishops exiled in Sardinia and were well received by them.²² With their departure from Rome the Scythian monks as a group disappear from history, but their position was staunchly upheld by the work both of their leader, John Maxentius, and of their famous countryman, Dionysius Exiguus, who at the time of the controversy had long lived in Rome.

The Scythian Theopaschite formula has a direct bearing upon the affairs of Boethius, for Father Schurr has proved that the Patrician's first and second theological tractates were called forth by the controversy over that formula. These treatises were written in 523, the year before Boethius was imprisoned.²³ Does this mean that he actively entered into the most important dispute of the time? Not at all, according to Father Schurr. Boethius' interest was purely scientific and speculative. That is, his philosophical curiosity was aroused when the Theopaschite question became an issue in Rome, and he at that time occupied himself with the Trinitarian problem which it presented.²⁴ In Father Schurr's opinion, then, Boethius was stirred to write Tr. I and II by

²⁰ See the very revealing letters of Dioscorus and Justinian, *Col. Avel.*, nos. 224 and 196. For the efficacy of the Scythian formula against the Nestorian sympathies of Chalcedon, see de Noris, *Dis. I.*, pp. 791–810; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II, 382; G. Krüger, "Theopaschiten," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, XIX, 659. The formula had been approved not only by such orthodox leaders as Proclus and Cyril of Alexandria but also, in a heretical sense, by Peter the Fuller, a Monophysite theologian, and it had been included in the Henoticon. Justinian, whose aim was utilitarian, soon saw that he could make good use of the formula. Catholics, like the Scythians, could accept the proposition as orthodox, Monophysites could interpret it as Peter the Fuller had, and moderates could remember its inclusion in Zeno's Henoticon. Justinian regarded it only as a means to an end.

²¹ *Col. Avel.*, no. 231, and John Maxentius, *Responsio adversus Hormisdæ epistolam, Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Tome IV, vol. 2, pp. 54–55; the *Acta* are hereafter cited as *ACO*. Schurr, pp. 159–61, is of the opinion that the monks remained in Rome until September, 520.

²² *Ep.* 16 and 17, *PL*, LXV, 442–93. See also H. de Noris, *Historia Pelagiana et dissertatio de synodo V oecumenico* (Padua, 1673), p. 306.

²³ Schurr, pp. 136–225. For a summary, see pp. 224–25. It is also shown (pp. 97–104) that Tr. II preceded Tr. I.

²⁴ Schurr, pp. 217–21. Note particularly on p. 221: "Wir sagen also: Nicht eigentlich aus Parteitheologie schrieb Boethius seine trinitarischen Werkchen, sondern als diese in die kirchenpolitisch interessierten Senatorenkreise hineingetragen ward, wurde sie ihm zur *Anregung* mehr aus wissenschaftlichem Selbstzweck auf spekulative und disziplinierte Art über die Trinität zu forschen." He adds that we cannot infer that Boethius was friendly to the Scythians, but concludes, "immerhin legt unser Ergebnis nahe, dass er ähnlich wie Vitalian und Justinian zur theopaschitischen Formel stand."

the Theopaschite formula, but he wrote only for his own satisfaction. If this view is correct, Boethius can by no means be regarded as an active disputant or even as a friendly partisan of the Scythian position.²⁵

For a number of reasons Father Schurr's view may be regarded as excessively cautious. Justinian's plan for, first, theological and then political unification had many ramifications, and there is evidence that Boethius had something to do with certain aspects of this plan. At this point, however, the background must be described a little more fully. It was suggested above that Justinian adopted the Scythian Theopaschite formula because it purged Chalcedon of Nestorianism and thus pacified the influential group of anti-Nestorian and pro-Monophysite Easterners. If only the West could be persuaded to accept the Scythian position also, ecclesiastical harmony was assured. The leading opponent of Nestorianism in the fifth century had been Cyril of Alexandria, a bishop whose relations with Rome had been cordial and whose name in the sixth century still evoked the greatest reverence. It is not surprising then that the Scythians requested Dionysius Exiguus, their countryman, to translate several of the respectable Cyril's anti-Nestorian works into Latin, hoping thus to win sympathy and prestige for their cause.²⁶ It was for the same practical purpose that an anonymous Scythian scholar made the great anti-Pelagian, anti-Nestorian, and pro-Cyrrillan compilation known as the *Collectio Palatina*.²⁷

The evidence of the Palatine Collection has importance for the case of Boethius. Eduard Schwartz pointed out twenty years ago that the compilation was prepared for use in the disputes of Justinian's time and that the anonymous collector was closely associated with a certain John, bishop of Tomi in Scythia. Schwartz conjectured that John of Tomi was John Maxentius.²⁸ Additional evidence in the form of a brief *instructio* by John of Tomi makes it all but a certainty that John Maxentius and John of Tomi were the same man.²⁹ There can be no question that the purpose of the Palatine Col-

²⁵ All Father Schurr believed he could say definitely was that Boethius' position in respect of the Theopaschite formula was similar to that of Vitalian and Justinian (p. 221). I imagine that he meant that Boethius regarded the formula as a means of achieving church unity, though I find the remark rather baffling. If Boethius wrote merely out of philosophical interest, as Schurr says, on what ground is an attitude similar to that of Vitalian and Justinian to be attributed to him?

²⁶ Schurr, p. 152.

²⁷ Edited by Eduard Schwartz, *ACO* I, 5, pars prior (Berlin and Leipzig, 1924-25). The anti-Pelagian portion was prepared by Marius Mercator, a disciple of St. Augustine. The rest of the collection, about two thirds of the whole, consists of translations from Greek to Latin.

²⁸ For Schwartz's discussion see *ACO* I, 5, first preface and his article, "Die sogenannten Gegenanathematismen des Nestorius," *Sitzung. d. Bay. Akad. zu München*, hist.-phil. Klasse, (1922).

²⁹ The *instructio* was discovered and published by Dom Morin, "Le témoignage perdu de Jean évêque de Tomi sur les hérésies de Nestorius et d'Eutychès," *Journal of Theological Studies*, VII (1906), 74-77. In my article "John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina," *Harvard Theologi-*

lection was to win Roman support for the Scythian theology. By including the anti-Pelagian works of St. Augustine's disciple, Marius Mercator, the compiler probably hoped to make his own orthodoxy all the clearer to Western readers. At the end of the extant portion of the original collection the Scythian scholar provides the interesting information that both Nestorians and Eutychians by their wiles were deceiving the ignorant. He himself feared that because of his anti-Nestorianism he would be called a Eutychian by the Nestorians. He appealed, therefore, to Maxentius' *instructio*, which simply and clearly defined both Nestorianism and Eutychianism.³⁰

That John Maxentius and Boethius were interested in the same theological problems Father Schurr has amply proved, but no one hitherto has established any closer contact between the two.³¹ The *instructio* found under the name of John of Tomi strongly suggests, however, that Maxentius relied on the arguments of Boethius as presented in Tr. V.³² The most striking similarities are indicated below.

The chief purpose of the formula *unus ex trinitate passus carne*, first offered by the Scythians in 519, was to protect Christ's divinity by allowing for his suffering as a human, *i.e.*, in his passible nature. In his *Liber contra Eutychen et Nestorium*, written in 512, Boethius gave strong dialectical support to the orthodox Scythian position in defense of the divine nature, showing that what is immutable and impassible, *i.e.*, the Godhead, cannot be subjected to suffering and death.³³ Then in 520 or a little later John Maxentius pointed out that the Eutychians were guilty of precisely this error.³⁴

cal Review, XXXVI (1943), 93-107, I present the case for the identity of John Maxentius and John of Tomi.

³⁰ ACO I, 5, pp. 180-81. There is a gap in the collection at this point and the *instructio* is missing. Schwartz was not aware that Dom Morin had found it.

³¹ Maxentius was concerned not only with the later Scythian controversy but also the first, as shown by Schurr (pp. 142-43). Note also Maxentius' and Boethius' common interest in the problem of numbers in the Godhead (Schurr, pp. 211-14).

³² It will be remembered that the earlier and later controversies were closely related. It was because Christ subsists not only *ex* but also *in duabus naturis* that the Scythians insisted upon the later formula *unus ex trinitate passus carne*.

³³ Note Boethius' discussion at the beginning of the sixth book of Tr. V, particularly ll. 5-15. In ll. 8-15 he says: "Sed si diuinitas in humanitatem translata est, factum est, quod credi nefas est, ut humanitate immutabili substantia permanente diuinitas uerteretur et quod passibile atque mutabile naturaliter existeret, id inmutabile permaneret, quod uero inmutabile atque impassibile naturaliter creditur, id in rem mutabilem uerteretur. Hoc igitur fieri nulla ratione contingit."

³⁴ In making these comparisons differences of expression must be allowed for. Boethius wrote a philosophical treatise, while Maxentius provided in simple language for the needs of the layman. For Maxentius' indictment of the Eutychians see Morin, p. 76, ll. 24-30: "dum enim timet ne si duas in xpo confitetur naturas quartam introducat in trinitate personam, inopia confusione ipsum dei filium a deitatis suae natura pronuntiat demutatum ita ut inconuertibilem dicat & passionibus subdat immortalemque morti subiciat & eum qui non cecidit (nec enim fas erat deum in sua diuinitate posse occidi) resurrexisse contendat." Boethius disposed of the Eutychian fear that a fourth person might be added to the Trinity in Tr. V. vii. 46-56.

The impressive similarity of the two theologians' language and argument may be made still clearer by comparing their remarks on the Eutychian view of Christ's nature. Maxentius in his definition explains that there are two groups of the heretics.³⁵ Some believe Christ assumed his nature whence he wished, not from the flesh of the Virgin Mary (of our nature, that is), but yet passible, while others think he had a nature coeternal with heavenly and spiritual beings and hold that he passed through the womb of Mary as water through a reed, assuming no flesh from her. Nevertheless, all the Eutychians assert that the word and the flesh are of one nature by a wicked mixture and confusion.³⁶ Boethius, in considering all conceivable Eutychian views as to the source of Christ's body, includes these two, which he shows to be untenable.³⁷ Boethius demonstrated why it was foolish to say Christ did not take his body from Mary. In effect he declared that if Eutyches believed this, that, or the other, he was in error. John briefly noted that some Eutychians actually did believe this, while others believed that, which was enough for a definition designed for plain people.

One more point in Tr. V requires attention. Toward the close of the seventh chapter Boethius gives a masterful summary of the orthodox position on the Christological and Trinitarian question.³⁸ In the course of this penetrating analysis he resolves succinctly and definitely the problem that had been so confused by both Nestorians and Monophysites, explaining that Christ, who is one of the Trinity, perfect man and God, suffered in the manhood.³⁹ This is nothing less than the Scythian contention that one member of the Trinity suffered in the flesh! Boethius does not actually say, *unus ex trinitate passus carne*. It is nevertheless highly significant that he should have stated so cogently the Scythian view in a passage written in 512 in defense of the first formula. It was only a few years later, in 519, that the monks appeared in Constantinople, brandishing their Theopaschite formula like a sword before the startled eyes of the papal delegation.

The significance of this evidence now begins to appear. Boethius was an

³⁵ It was only later that Monophysitism split up into many sects.

³⁶ Morin, p. 76, ll. 30-37: "Alii autem eiusdem perfidiae sectatores dicunt, quod filius dei non de Mariae uirginis carne hoc est nostrae naturae sed passibilem unde uoluit sibi adsumpsit. alii de caelestibus eum & spiritalibus coaeternam habuisse existimant, ac per uterum Mariae uirginis ueluti aquam per fistulam nihil ex ea carnis adsumens transisse contendunt. omnes tamen hi uerbum & carnem unius esse naturae impia permixtione confusioneque confirmant."

³⁷ Tr. V. v. 24-35. Note especially (27-32): "Sed si tempore generationis [adunatio] facta est, uidetur putare et ante generationem fuisse humanam carnem non a Maria sumptam sed aliquo modo alio praeparatam, Mariam uero uirginem appositam ex qua caro nasceretur quae ab ea sumpta non esset." And below, ll. 97-101: "Traxisse autem hanc sententiam uidetur, si tamen huius erroris fuit ut crederet non fuisse corpus Christi uere ex homine sed extra atque adeo in caelo formatum, quoniam cum eo in caelum creditur ascendisse."

³⁸ *Ibid.*, V. vii, 46-79. ³⁹ Note particularly ll. 46-56.

enthusiastic advocate of orthodoxy, following closely the theological developments of his day. In 512 he attended the assembly at which the Eastern bishops' plea for help was read.⁴⁰ Seeing at once the importance of the issue raised by the bishops, he effectively lent them his aid by means of Tr. V.⁴¹ A comparison of Tr. V and John Maxentius' *instructio*, written in 520 or later, seems to indicate that the Scythian leader borrowed directly from the work of the Roman writer.⁴² In 519 the monks appear, upholding the same views as Boethius and even offering a formula suggested, though not in so many words, in Boethius' earliest treatise. And then in 523 Boethius was stimulated by the Theopaschite controversy to write two more tractates. Are we to believe that he wrote only for a friend or two, as he says in the introductory remarks of Tr. I and V? It seems wiser to attribute his rather pretentious lack of interest in the public to rhetorical exaggeration or perhaps to caution, for the tractates obviously had considerable currency and influence. To conclude that Boethius meant his carefully worked-out clarification of the question only for his friends is to assume that he solved an important, troublesome, and potentially dangerous problem out of intellectual curiosity alone. This assumption hardly seems borne out by the evidence, since in the years after 512 the theology he expounded in Tr. V was adopted by some of those whose plight had impelled him to write in the first place. And this theology became the nucleus around which the imperial plans revolved.

It must be admitted, however, that Boethius' profound interest in theological matters and the probable use of his writings by the Scythians do not prove that the Roman Patrician was a partner in Justinian's policy of ecclesiastical and political unification. At the same time it is only fair to say that if Boethius' purpose in supporting the Scythian theology was the same as Justinian's, both men would have made every effort to conceal the fact. We know that in the years immediately preceding Boethius' arrest prolonged negotiations were carried on between the Byzantine court and the leaders of the Roman church and senate.⁴³ But always Boethius remained in the background, and one wonders why so prominent a man kept himself so ostentatiously aloof from a matter in which he was unquestionably interested. In a puzzle such as this many of the questions that we should like to ask cannot be answered, even though strong probabilities may be established. In the matter of the dealings

⁴⁰ Tr. V, preface.

⁴¹ Note the parallel passages from the episcopal letter and Tr. V, cited by Schurr, pp. 108-109.

⁴² The explanation may be that Maxentius hoped, through his reliance upon Boethius, to win Western support more easily. His *instructio*, like the Palatine Collection, must have been prepared primarily for use in Rome.

⁴³ Duchesne, *L'église au VI^e siècle*, pp. 130-31.

between Rome and Constantinople, however, there is some rather impressive information which serves to implicate Boethius. This, together with the evidence of his theological activities, makes his co-operation with Justinian seem more than likely.

It is well established that the Roman senate had actively engaged in the ecclesiastical struggle from the time of Felix III (483-92). One prominent senator after another had visited the Eastern capital, hoping to bring the long conflict to an end. Theodoric, who had great respect for the position of the emperor, had acquiesced in these efforts; in fact he had given his definite approval when consulted by the cautious Hormisdas.⁴⁴ Clearly it was to the king's advantage to live at peace with the great power in the East, and for a long time, it is plain, he suspected nothing of Justinian's political scheme. Then suddenly Theodoric's attitude changed. He ordered the arrest of three prominent aristocrats, Albinus, Boethius, and Symmachus, and according to Boethius, questioned the loyalty of the whole senate.⁴⁵ It seems evident that the negotiations with Constantinople were responsible.⁴⁶ But what did Boethius have to do with them? The question is answered by an examination of the activities of Albinus and Symmachus.

Albinus' keen interest in the theological conflict is indicated in a letter addressed by Hormisdas to Dioscorus, asking about the status of those who rejected the Council of Chalcedon.⁴⁷ Albinus had raised the question, whether those who condemned the council in speech were to be regarded in the same way as those who had condemned it in writing, and the pope wanted Dioscorus' opinion. The allusion to those who opposed Chalcedon in speech is illuminating. Who could they have been but the Scythian monks who were at that very moment in Rome? Although the monks had not attacked the council in writing, Dioscorus had done his best to turn the pope against them, insisting that they were hostile to Chalcedon.⁴⁸ It would appear that Albinus intervened in behalf of the monks. Even if that was not the purpose of his inquiry, there can be no doubt that this prominent senator carefully followed the negotiations by means of which Justinian's highly prized *ecclesiarum concordia* was to be won.

Symmachus' connection with the unification movement is revealed, rather

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 128-31; Schurr, pp. 111-12, 198-207; and Coster, p. 41.

⁴⁵ *Phil. Consol.*, I. iv. 112-17.

⁴⁶ Duchesne, *L'église au VI^e siècle*, pp. 130-31.

⁴⁷ *Col. Avel.*, no. 173, but it is significant that this letter was not sent. A different version, from which the incriminating references to Albinus and Chalcedon were omitted, was dispatched on December 3, 519. On the same date Hormisdas wrote to the other delegates dealing with the Scythian monks in no admiring terms.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, nos. 216, 224. In no. 224 Dioscorus charged that the monks clamored for the addition of their Theopaschite formula, because Chalcedon alone did not suffice to counteract Nestorianism.

circuitously, through one of Maxentius' pamphlets and a papal letter. Maxentius' *Responsio adversus Hormisdas Epistulam*, composed after the monks' departure from Rome, was a reply to an attack directed against the monks by the pope.⁴⁹ In a remarkable passage in this defense the Scythian leader proudly proclaimed that Hormisdas had unequivocally approved of the Scythian position. He pointed out that the pope well knew the Scythian view on *unus ex trinitate*, and if he had considered this teaching heretical the pontiff obviously would not have admitted the monks to his communion in the period of almost fourteen months during which he kept them at Rome. Moreover, in the presence of many distinguished men, Hormisdas had asked the Byzantine *magister militum*, Romanus, to tell the emperor that if Dioscorus, who was still in the Eastern capital, would not accept the Scythian formula, he should be cast into the sea.⁵⁰

In spite of the rather strong language used of Dioscorus, there is, so far as I can see, no conceivable reason for doubting the reliability of this statement. It is true, as Maxentius says, that Hormisdas forcibly detained the monks in Rome, even while Justinian was asking for their safe return.⁵¹ And Maxentius would hardly have dared to manufacture the pope's remark to Romanus, made in the presence of many witnesses. Then how is the pope's later attack on the monks to be explained? Maxentius himself suggests the most likely answer: perhaps Dioscorus persuaded Hormisdas to repudiate his decision in favor of the monks.⁵²

Whatever the explanation of Hormisdas' reversal of policy, the importance of Maxentius' evidence can hardly be exaggerated. The message entrusted to Romanus, supporting the formula adopted by Justinian in July, 519, shows that the pope kept the closest watch over all aspects of the Eastern situation.⁵³ The consultations with Romanus also indicate that the affairs of the Byzantine court, the pope, and the Scythian monks were bound up together.

That the pope actually was in touch with Romanus is revealed by none other than Hormisdas himself, and so we have a further witness to the

⁴⁹ *ACO* IV, 2, 46-62. The attack of Hormisdas, dated August 13, 520, is to be found in *ibid.*, IV, 2, 44-46, and *Col. Avel.*, no. 231. Maxentius pretended that the letter was a forgery, thus leaving himself quite free to answer the pope's attack.

⁵⁰ *ACO* IV, 2, 51.

⁵¹ *Col. Avel.*, no. 227.

⁵² *ACO* IV, 2, 51. Another possibility is that fear of Theodoric led the pope to change his position. It is not always easy to understand Hormisdas' policy but one should remember that he was a cautious as well as a clever diplomat, and that his position was perilous: his successor, John I, who had incurred the wrath of Theodoric, died in prison.

⁵³ Romanus must be the Byzantine military leader who fought the Arabs and Persians and helped lead a raid on the Apulian coast in 508 (Hodgkin, III, 399; and Pauly-Wissowa, Romanus 13). In any case he was a high official of the Eastern court and therefore without doubt close to Justinian.

reliability of John Maxentius. Hormisdas' reference to Romanus is contained in an anxious letter addressed to the legates in Constantinople, urgently requesting news.⁵⁴ The pope announced in his letter that both Romanus and the *uir magnificus patricius Symmachus* had promised the embassy's return without delay. It seems very likely that the Symmachus thus mentioned was Boethius' father-in-law. Had there been another Symmachus considered worthy of dealing with both pope and emperor in so vital a matter, some other record of him would almost surely survive.⁵⁵ If my surmise as to the identity of Symmachus is correct, the appearance of his name together with that of a high Byzantine official is very enlightening. The Roman Symmachus was probably among the many distinguished men present, according to Maxentius, when Hormisdas gave his message to Romanus. Whether Symmachus went to Constantinople at the same time as Romanus we cannot tell. Both dignitaries were active in the ecclesiastical dispute, however, and the participation of so notable a member of the Roman aristocracy would again show how close was the relationship between powerful Eastern and Western groups interested in unification. We cannot doubt that Boethius was keenly aware of all that transpired. His theological activity alone is sufficient guarantee of that. If the Symmachus mentioned by Hormisdas is Boethius' intimate friend and beloved patron, Boethius' knowledge of the conspiracy is put beyond question.⁵⁶

Now, in a brief summation, the case against Boethius amounts to this:

I. It is certain that Boethius, one of the ablest philosopher-theologians of his time, was directly stimulated by the Scythian controversies to write three of his theological tractates.

II. It appears likely that John Maxentius, the Scythian leader, drew upon Boethius' Tr. V, the *Liber contra Eutychen et Nestorium*, in preparing for Roman perusal his brief definitions of Eutychianism and Nestorianism.

⁵⁴ *Col. Avel.*, no. 229, dated July 15, 520. Apparently Hormisdas was as conservative as ever, for on July 9 Justinian wrote asking him to be more lenient with the Easterners and again urging acceptance of the Scythian formula (*ibid.*, no. 196).

⁵⁵ Yet the Symmachus referred to in Hormisdas' correspondence is described in Pauly-Wissowa, Symmachus 36, only as "*Patricius und Magister officiorum am Hofe von Konstantinopel*." I suppose he is thus designated because a certain *magistrianius* of Symmachus is mentioned in another of Hormisdas' letters (*ibid.*, no. 221). *Magistriani* were officials connected with the post under the *magister officiorum*, but I am not convinced that the papal letter meant to indicate such service. Yet, even if it be granted that this Symmachus was Master of the Offices, why should it be assumed that he was an Eastern, rather than a Western, official? The Roman Patrician had already been honored by positions of trust; perhaps in 519 and 520 he held the office which we know was given to his son-in-law in 522. This would help explain Theodoric's rage against both men. One other point is worth mentioning. Symmachus is not described as *magister officiorum* in the *Anecdota Holderi*, but then neither is Boethius, and it is certain that he held the position.

⁵⁶ Boethius' respect for his father-in-law was profound, as shown by the prefaces of Tr. I and Tr. V. Tr. I, inspired by the Scythian Theopaschite controversy and written in 523, just before Boethius' fall, was dedicated to Symmachus. One may feel unusually sure that if Symmachus was involved in Justinian's larger plan, Boethius was also.

III. It is certain that Albinus, one of the pro-Byzantine party in the Roman senate, took a lively interest in the Theopaschite dispute. When Albinus was charged with treason, Boethius was his ardent defender.

IV. It is probable that Symmachus, the friend and father-in-law of Boethius, also engaged actively in the negotiations with the Eastern court, and it is known that Boethius dedicated Tr. I to Symmachus.

V. These two important members of the Roman aristocracy were arrested for treason along with Boethius. All three were in one way or another connected either with the theological issue or with the negotiations by which Justinian hoped to pacify Eastern Christendom and then to unite both East and West.

Even if we did not know that Boethius was arraigned for treason, we might suspect him of the crime on the basis of this evidence. For it cannot be denied that he appears deeply enmeshed, both through his theological writings and through his personal ties, in the imperial plan aiming at unification.

In defense of Boethius two points may be made. First, there is the fact that he did not consider himself guilty of any crime and that he impugned the reliability of his accusers.⁵⁷ While proclaiming his innocence, however, Boethius confessed with pride that he tried to hold back information by which the senate would have been proved guilty of treason.⁵⁸ There is an apparent contradiction here: he denies guilt but admits tampering with evidence. The explanation, it seems to me, is simply that a man of Boethius' views would not regard either support of ecclesiastical union or the protection of the senate as treasonable. His savage references to the greed and rapacity of upstart Gothic officials, against whom he stood in defense of the Romans, show that he resented the treatment of his countrymen.⁵⁹ In the *Consolation of Philosophy* Boethius declares his loyalty, not to the king, to whom he does not even refer by name, but to the Roman senate. In short, what was commendable to Boethius was treason to Theodoric. As for Boethius' vituperative condemnation of his three accusers, two of the three are highly praised by Cassiodorus.⁶⁰ Consequently the zealous defender of Boethius must damn Cassiodorus, in the circumstances a harsh alternative, since Cassiodorus was fully as well informed as Boethius and less likely to be swayed by passion. It would be safer to attribute Boethius' denunciation to a natural hatred of those who testified against him.

The second point in favor of Boethius' innocence is that in 522 Theodoric

⁵⁷ *Phil. Consol.*, I. iv. 57-75, 120-23.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, I. iv. 71-81, 111-17.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, I. iv. 34-51.

⁶⁰ Hodgkin, III, 491-93. Nothing more is definitely known of the third accuser. See also Coster, pp. 51, 63. I am not convinced by Coster's argument (p. 63) for believing Boethius rather than Cassiodorus, chiefly because I think the latter was in a better position to speak the truth and also because we cannot be sure that Boethius had given up hope of pardon.

gave proof of his confidence in the Patrician by making him *magister officiorum*. Father Schurr relies quite heavily on this seeming indication of Boethius' blamelessness.⁶¹ That Boethius maintained treasonable relations with Constantinople he considers untenable.⁶² But is it not more likely that Boethius enjoyed the king's favor in 522 because Theodoric was still ignorant of the Patrician's relations with the East? It appears that Theodoric did not guess the exact nature of Justinian's plan until 523, the year in which the diplomatic Pope Hormisdas died. Then the efforts of Boethius in behalf of unity may have taken on an entirely different aspect. When the king at last became aware of Justinian's political design, masked by the apparently harmless negotiations between the Eastern and Western churches, his rage must have been boundless. He had been betrayed by men whom he trusted. His surprise must have been all the greater since the Emperor Justin had seemed well disposed and Boethius devoted.⁶³ Yet when Albinus was charged with dealing treasonably with Justin, Boethius rushed to his defense.⁶⁴ What was more natural at this point than that Theodoric should investigate the activities of the man who sought to defend a traitor and to whom the great powers of *magister officiorum* had been entrusted? Then the *Liber contra Eutychem et Nestorium*, which ten years before would have seemed unobjectionable, must have begun to appear dangerous. For in it, as well as in two other treatises, Boethius supported the position maintained by the Scythian monks. And it was the position of these monks, who had been so active among the people and senate of Rome, that Justinian had seized upon in 519 in his search for a theology which might unify all the East and also appeal to the West. That Albinus and Symmachus had likewise been much interested in the supposedly ecclesiastical negotiations helped to bind them closely to what

⁶¹ Schurr considers it improbable (p. 201, n. 316) that Boethius' and Albinus' interest or participation in the settlement of the Acacian schism afterward worked against them. But Albinus and Boethius kept on working for Justinian's larger plan of unification *after* that preliminary union was achieved in 519. It was surely to carry out this larger plan aiming at political unification that Justinian in July, 519, adopted the Scythian Theopaschite formula which in 523 induced Boethius to write Tr. I and II.

⁶² Schurr (p. 201, n. 316) appeals for support to the article of Giovanni B. Picotti, "Il senato romano e il processo di Boezio," *Archivio storico italiano*, Ser. VII, Vol. XV (Firenze, 1931), pp. 205-28. I am surprised that Father Schurr should regard Picotti's article as *eine gediegene Zurückweisung* of the charge of treason, since Picotti throughout neglects the theological aspect of the affair, going so far indeed as to say (p. 208) that it can be doubted whether Boethius was a Christian. Picotti makes much of Boethius' silence, in his defense, in respect of the religious question, but that is what one would expect of a guilty man.

⁶³ Justin had agreed to the appointment of Theodoric's son-in-law to the consulship in 519 (Coster, p. 41).

⁶⁴ The referendarius, Cyprian, who brought the charges against both Albinus and Boethius, had got wind of suspicious negotiations carried on between Roman senators and Eastern officials. See Stewart, *Boethius*, p. 43. It is no wonder Cyprian became alarmed, since such influential men as Justinian, Symmachus, Albinus, Romanus, and Vitalian were involved, as indicated by the *Collectio Avellana*.

must have seemed to the king clearly a revolutionary movement. Theodoric faced the failure of his regime and the destruction of his power. All who had been connected with the affair became suspect, and among these was Boethius.⁶⁵

We must conclude that Boethius, the Roman noble, was proud of the Roman tradition and loyal to it. He was also an orthodox Christian who could not approve of his country's subservience to Theodoric's Arian barbarians. We know for a certainty that he took up the theological position of the Scythian monks, by means of which Justinian's plan of empire was to be furthered. Thus he had both a motive and a method for combating the tyranny of the Goths. Finally we know that he fell under the king's suspicion and, charged with treason and sacrilege, was arrested. It is easy, out of a desire to defend Boethius, to overlook Theodoric's side of the case. Are we to believe that the king, a man of balance and unusual tolerance, who had greatly honored Boethius, suddenly turned on him without good cause? Are we to assume that Theodoric accepted weak evidence? Everything is against it. Coming after all the trust which the king had reposed in Boethius, the disclosure of his treachery must have been exceedingly painful to Theodoric. It was a discovery no man would like to make and one for which he would insist upon incontrovertible proof. There is then all the more reason to believe that there was strong indication of treason.⁶⁶ What could it have been but Boethius' unmistakable sympathy with Justinian's imperial policy, a sympathy made plain both by his support of the Scythian theology and by his close contact with those who strove for an ecclesiastical harmony which they hoped would be followed by political unification based on the destruction of Theodoric's power.

Boethius did not suffer "martyrdom." It was not because of his theological

⁶⁵ Note that, though Stewart, *Boethius*, pp. 156-57, realized that the question dealt with in Tr. V was "fraught with an interest quite as much political as religious," the "political" interest which Stewart had in mind was not the same as that put forward here. Stewart believed that Boethius meant to support the see of Rome as against the see of Constantinople and thereby to add luster to Theodoric's own position as ruler of the West. On pp. 158-59 Stewart offers a rather ingenious explanation of Boethius' strange failure to mention Christianity in the *Consolation of Philosophy*. To suggest another, the tone of Boethius' defense of himself leads me to suspect that he still hoped to regain his freedom. If so, might he not have thought it wise to leave the subject of religion alone?

⁶⁶ For the charge of divination see Coster, p. 63. For another view see R. Bonnaud, "L'éducation scientifique de Boèce," *Speculum*, IV (1929), 198-206, especially pp. 200-201. The temptation to exculpate the "last of the Romans" at the expense of a "barbarian" must be guarded against. Stewart, *Boethius*, p. 51, accuses Theodoric of "an act of blind cruelty, such as the condemnation of Boethius and Symmachus undoubtedly was." Why "undoubtedly"? Theodoric's character is no more open to censure than Boethius' own. Though Stewart admits that Boethius had faults, he defends him rather vigorously against Dr. Hodgkin's strictures. I cannot avoid the conclusion that Boethius could be harsh, selfish, and arrogant, and that he well knew how to consult his own interest.

activities that he fell from Theodoric's favor but because the theological activities were part of a program aiming at political unity. There is no evidence that Arianism was involved.⁶⁷ In itself Boethius' orthodox theology was no more dangerous to the Gothic regime in 523 than it had been in 512. So it was the combination of theology and politics that brought about Boethius' fall. The political aspect accounts for the condemnation, but the political aspect cannot be explained apart from the theological. Boethius' part in this affair will hardly improve his reputation. He lacked the steadfastness of Cassiodorus, being apparently unaware of the inconsistency of accepting gifts of power and prestige from Theodoric while working for the king's overthrow. At the end at least he was loyal to what he believed in and risked everything for it. And in prison he turned again, happily, to philosophy. It was unfortunate, for the cause of learning as well as for Boethius, that he ever abandoned her. Theodoric's fame is enhanced. There is little reason now to cling to the belief that this king, renowned for his extraordinary wisdom and justice, reversed his policy at the end of his life and wantonly murdered Boethius.

Lawrence College

⁶⁷ Schurr, pp. 222-23; Picotti, pp. 206-207; Rand, *Speculum*, XI, 155, and *Building of Eternal Rome*, p. 239.

Thurlow Weed: A Character Study

GLYNDON G. VAN DEUSEN*

THURLOW Weed was an important force in the political life of the United States for almost half a century. As newspaper editor and political "counselor" he guided the destinies of three parties in New York state—Antimasonic, Whig, and Republican—with great prescience and skill. He made and unmade a host of office holders, from canal watchmen and customs inspectors to governors. He was a power in the nomination and election of two Presidents of the United States, and more perhaps than any man save Henry Clay himself, Weed was the obstacle that stood in the way of the great Kentuckian's elevation to the presidency. The New Yorker exerted a powerful influence upon the economic development of state and nation through the medium of party guidance, and by the standards which he practiced or condoned in political and economic life he made a distinct contribution to the mores of his time and to the traditions of his country. His friends called him "The Dictator," and there was affection and respect in their use of the term. His enemies referred to him as "The Lucifer of the Lobby," "Fagin the Jew," and in later years contemptuously as "The Old Man." These titles were worlds apart in their implications, but complimentary or derogatory they all pointed to one outstanding fact. Men might love and respect Thurlow Weed; they might hate and despise him; but no one who took any interest in the politics and government of the country could ignore him.

Weed's career challenges interpretation, and added weight is lent to the challenge by the fact that no objective study of the man has yet been made. The liberal trend in American historical writing, a trend never more pronounced than at the present, has passed an easy and somewhat superficial judgment upon this nineteenth century conservative, and, with one or two exceptions, historians and biographers have dismissed him as a man whose motives were questionable and whose public morals were, to put it mildly, peculiar.¹ Blame or praise, he deserves better than such cursory treatment.

*The author, now an associate professor at the University of Rochester, has for some years been working on a life of Thurlow Weed.

¹For typical derogatory comment see D. R. Lynch, "Party Struggles, 1828-1850," in *History of the State of New York*, Alexander C. Flick, ed. (10 vols., New York, 1933-37), VI, 71-72; Dorothy B. Goebel, *William Henry Harrison* (Indianapolis, 1926), p. 339 and note. A more balanced judgment of Weed's career is to be found in Dixon Ryan Fox, *The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York* (New York, 1919), p. 336, and in the article on Weed in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIX, 598.

The forebears of Thurlow Weed provided him with a New England background and heritage of middle-class characteristics. They were pious, law-abiding folk, who had spread out from Massachusetts Bay, where the first American ancestor, Jonas Weed, had landed from the Winthrop fleet in 1630. Jonas hailed from near Stamford, Northampton County, England, but nothing is known about the English origins of the family save that tradition, a most uncertain evidence, linked their line with the great Edward Thurlow, Lord High Chancellor of England from 1778 to 1792. Thurlow Weed tried on one of his trips to England to find his family's record at Doctor's Commons. The search was fruitless and he fell to speculating about the possibility of a French origin, to the irreverent mirth of his friend William Kent. "You are not descended from the De Grasses," jeered Kent, "you are genuine Saxon 'by the soul of Hengist.'"² Even this could be doubted, of course, but of one thing there could be no doubt. Young Thurlow was a Yankee to his finger tips.

Joel Weed, Thurlow's father, was the first of the line to leave New England. His eldest son, named Edward Thurlow after the Chancellor, was born in a log cabin near Acra, Greene County, York state, on November 15, 1797. The boy's early life was distinguished chiefly by poverty and migrations, for the shiftless Joel, no stranger to the debtor's prison, was always convinced that better fortunes lay just beyond the horizon. By the time young Thurlow (the "Edward" soon disappeared) was an adolescent, the family had moved from Acra to Catskill on the Hudson and then out into the frontier regions of central New York. Such circumstances meant of necessity firsthand acquaintance with want and suffering and with the other manifold lessons of the frontier. They also meant little formal education. There were some scattered months of schooling in Catskill and in the little hamlets to the west, but by the time Thurlow was eight years old he had found a job as bellows blower in a smithy at eight cents a day. Thereafter life was a curious mixture of labors, from wading about on carpet-bound feet among the snows of a central New York sugar bush to learning the printer's art. This last employment exercised a peculiar fascination, and by 1812 Thurlow was a full-fledged journeyman printer. Thenceforward he traveled up and down the state after the manner of his craft, working in town or city as employ-

² Weed Papers, Kent to Weed, Dec. 28, 1853. For genealogical evidence see, among others, William R. Cutter, *New England Families* (New York, 1914), I, 407; George H. Chadwick and Jessie V. V. Vedder, *The "Old Times" Corner* (Greene County Historical Society Publications, Catskill, 1932), I, 99; Elijah B. Huntington, *Registration of Births, Marriages, and Deaths of Stamford Families* (Stamford, 1874), pp. 125-33; Charles E. Banks, *The Planters of the Commonwealth* (Boston, 1883), p. 1; Thurlow W. Barnes, *Memoir of Thurlow Weed* (Boston, 1884), pp. 1-2.

ment or curiosity borned and finally taking his penniless family (he had married in 1818) to Rochester. The trip to Rochester was made in the fall of 1822, and in that rapidly growing frontier town, America's first boom town, he made his real start on a march from rags to riches, from insignificance to power, that epitomized much of the history of nineteenth century America.

Weed was tall and of generous frame, with broad shoulders that acquired a confidential stoop. His large hazel eyes were set wide apart under heavy brows. His nose and chin were well defined, his lips full and generous. It was an expressive face, remarkably handsome, to judge by the Chester Harding portrait, strong to the point of ruthlessness, as caught by Brady's camera. As Weed grew older, as his face became deeply lined and his hair snow-white, he developed a carefully cultivated air of benevolent simplicity. It was in the Benjamin Franklin tradition, Henry Adams noted, and there is some evidence that Weed rather fancied himself as the nineteenth century printer and leader upon whom Franklin's mantle had fallen.³ Certain it is that he resembled the Philadelphia sage in his devotion to "the art preservative of all arts," a devotion which rivaled his interest in the great game of politics.

Weed's character, like Franklin's, was as complex as a Breughel canvas crowded with detail and full of lights and shadows. He took delight in noting the foibles of humanity. "Did you know that Alex. Hamilton [jr.] had made a fortune out of stocks?" he wrote to Francis Granger. "They say \$100,000! It has cured him of dyspepsia."⁴ He had an almost impish love of tormenting his foes and occasionally of teasing his friends. Weed derived much amusement from bantering the abstemious Seward about imaginary tavern revels in Albany. He rocked with laughter over Crosswell's "three-walled house" and "Marcy's pantaloons," and the startled Democrats winced as the lash of his wit flicked them on the raw. But his appreciation was not so keen when it came to jokes upon himself, and there never was an ironical

³ Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (Boston, 1918), p. 146. Weed's editorial columns repeatedly referred to incidents in Franklin's life, lauded Franklin's virtues, and urged young men to follow his example (as Weed had done). Franklin's likeness appeared at the top of the editorial column in the *Albany Evening Journal* on April 30, 1833, and remained there while Weed continued as editor. The *Journal* and other papers under Weed's direction showed a penchant for columns of wise saws, moral advice, and useful hints after the manner of Poor Richard. Franklin's *Autobiography*, Weed felt, should be the "Second Book" in every household, and Weed's "Farewell" to the readers of the *Journal* contained two references to Franklin, one being a pledge to devote the rest of his life "to the practise of Dr. Franklin's golden precept of doing as much good and as little evil as possible."

⁴ Weed Papers, Weed to Granger, n.d. A letter to James Kelley affords an amusing instance of this cynical humor: "I would, as you know, do all in my power for Brennan. But the Governor [John A. King] hangs fire! He is startled at the idea of pardoning a School Commissioner who was robbed in a Bawdy House and then went into a fight there about \$17. If the conductors of the Press would ask it there would be a chance." Weed Letters (Albany State Library), Weed to Kelley, Nov. 1, 1858.

note in his examination of his own career. His exuberant vitality produced a physical and mental activity far beyond the ordinary. He read widely, though not deeply, in history, travel, contemporary novels, and political writings, found considerable time to devote to such puzzles as the authorship of the Waverley novels and the Junius letters, traveled in energetic bursts that left his companions gasping for breath, and devoted an immense amount of time to New York state's political machinery. His private letters bear witness to the hectic pace at which his life was set. They are written in a furious scrawl that tears madly across the page, not infrequently leaving out a noun or a verb in the rush of expression. The signature is apt to be "in haste." And yet, with all this close approximation to "pure act," caution in regard to party policies and a capacity for careful political maneuvering were the outstanding characteristics of his public career.

Weed's personal relations were often marked by contrasts and contradictions. A deep and understanding sympathy for destitute or afflicted individuals was one of his best qualities, and his generosity, especially during the first three quarters of his life, was a matter of common knowledge. But once let his ire be aroused, he became as cruel and unrelenting an opponent as could be found among his contemporaries. His capacity for exciting affectionate regard was unusual, to say the least. Women trusted him and children loved him. Seward's letters are full of expressions of the deepest devotion. There were others, like the quasi-genius Henry O'Rielly, editor and political opponent of Rochester days, who loathed him, and William Cullen Bryant could never bring himself to cross palms with the man whom he despised. Weed found admiration among men of high quality who were politically opposed to him. William Learned Marcy came to regard him as a "special friend," and Jabez D. Hammond wrote feelingly of "the respect and friendship I feel for you founded on an acquaintance of many years."⁵ But fellow Republicans like Horace Greeley and George Opdyke learned to hate him with a bitter hatred. Seldom has a human being's circle of intimates furnished a more startling study in contrasts than is afforded by Weed's simultaneous and close relationships with Hamilton Fish, Edwin D. Morgan—and A. Oakey Hall, the mayor who served "as the mountebank of the 'Tweed Ring.'"⁶

Contrast even marked Weed's attitude toward the great game of politics.

⁵ Weed Papers, W. L. Marcy to Weed, n.d., but evidently during Marcy's occupancy of the State Department; J. D. Hammond to Weed, Dec. 8, 1842.

⁶ *Dictionary of American Biography*, VIII, 115. Weed openly avowed friendship for Hall, a number of whose letters are in the Weed Papers. The letters which bear out the avowal all date before the exposé of the ring.

He went to his death an advocate of the spoils system and an opponent of civil service reform, but he made it a rule never to ask a favor for a relative. He did not hesitate to buy votes, openly confessing the practice, nor did he hesitate to push highly questionable bills through a New York legislature that was rotten with corruption. But the suggestion that he himself was susceptible to bribery would send him into a berserk rage,⁷ and he could write with perfect sincerity—"If Ballard sold his office I have nothing more to say for him. I had not heard any impeachment of his character, and believed him an honest man."⁸ Weed was a strange medley of contradictions. Seward came the nearest to epitomizing his character when he remarked that "The Dictator" would never do as governor, because he would pardon all the criminals in state's prison and then get himself put in jail for pipelaying.⁹

The complexity of Weed's character furnishes some indication of the difficulties that confront any would-be analyst of his principles. These difficulties are not insuperable, however, for among the various and diverse elements of his make-up significant qualities appear, qualities which furnish the keys to his conduct and to his philosophy of life.

The generosity of Weed's nature and the ease with which his sympathies could be excited by individual cases of human suffering are qualities which partially account for his interest in a large variety of movements calculated to relieve popular misery and distress. From his earliest days as an editor he raised his voice against the harsh and cruel treatment of the Indians. He carried on a vigorous and successful campaign in New York state for the abolition of imprisonment for debt. Although frequently disgusted by the fanaticism and impracticability of the prohibitionists, he repeatedly went on record as an advocate of temperance, doing so on any number of occasions when strong drink was not a significant political issue.¹⁰ Weed stood staunchly against repeal of the laws banning usury in New York state and took high ground in doing so. The columns of the *Albany Evening Journal* were used again and again to urge a host of charitable and benevolent reforms, from relief for orphans and idiots to the improvement of the state prisons. There were times, as in 1830 and 1831 and again a decade later, when he came close to meriting the title of humanitarian. Nor was his interest limited to benevolent enterprise. There is evidence that he was not a stranger to broader aspirations for the public welfare.

⁷ Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life* (New York, 1868), pp. 312-13.

⁸ E. D. Morgan Papers, Weed to Morgan, Feb. 7, 1864.

⁹ W. H. Seward, *An Autobiography from 1801 to 1834, with a Memoir* (New York, 1891), p. 687.

¹⁰ *Albany Evening Journal*, Jan. 18, 19, Dec. 28, 1831; Aug. 7, 1835; 1841-42, *passim*; Oct. 17, 1846.

The heyday of Weed's life was the Middle Period, that lusty, hustling, optimistic era when one of the primary characteristics of the American people was a firm belief in the dignity of the common man and the necessity of freedom for the individual. Weed reflected this faith in a variety of ways, in part because he was a politician but also in part because it represented things in which he believed. The *Journal* always stood staunchly for freedom of speech, press, and petition.¹¹ Its editor paid repeated service to the principle of political democracy. He denounced the Turks and the Holy Alliance as the enemies of liberty.¹² He applauded the July Revolution in France, stigmatizing Charles X as "a tyrant who oppressed and enslaved the people,"¹³ and he repeatedly expressed sympathy for the oppressed Belgians and Poles. His indignation was excited by the regime of Louis Philippe, by India's subjection to British "plunderers," by Austrian oppression of the Magyars, by efforts anywhere and everywhere to prevent the development of middle-class government.¹⁴ Slavery he was ready and willing to criticize from his earliest newspaper days, and there can be no question in any candid mind of his deep and sincere loathing for that institution, a loathing that more than once drew sharp rebuke from other Whig papers.¹⁵ The *Journal* and its editor were consistent opponents of religious intolerance and of the invidious treatment of foreigners. Weed denounced religious bigotry and antiforeign prejudice, even when manifested by Whigs, in the early 1830's, and he staunchly upheld Seward's proposal that schools be established for the children of foreigners with teachers who spoke their language and professed their religious faith, when that proposal was undermining Seward as governor and Weed as a party leader.¹⁶ Despite the storm of opposition that blew up from the Whig Nativist groups, despite the repeated and melancholy proofs that the immigrants gravitated irresistibly into the Demo-

¹¹ This was especially noticeable at the time of the gag rule controversy and when the South interfered with the mails. On October 30, 1835, Weed published Gerrit Smith's remarks on freedom of speech, with an explanation for so doing. In this he stated that he was against abolition, but that "as Americans, we are in favor of the Liberty of Speech and the Freedom of Discussion. The Abolitionists are wrong, and can be put down by fair argument. But however wrong, when violence is used to silence them, their opponents become the aggressors."

¹² *Rochester Telegraph*, Dec. 24, 1822; July 22, Dec. 9, 16, 23, 30, 1823. In the issue of Jan. 3, 1826, he bemoaned the lack of liberty in Europe.

¹³ *Albany Evening Journal*, Sept. 6, 27, 1830.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 17, 1835; Apr. 20, 1842; *New York Commercial Advertiser*, Apr. 27, 1867, ff.; Aug. 17, 1867.

¹⁵ It is true that Weed's denunciation of the South's peculiar institution was often coupled with attacks upon the Democratic party's policy toward slavery. But to argue from this that his opposition was merely political would be superficial. The Whig party was not a sectional party, and there was a powerful proslavery element among the New York state Whigs, especially in New York City.

¹⁶ *Albany Evening Journal*, Oct. 22, 1835, an editorial on an Albany County Whig convention resolution denouncing foreigners. Cf. also the issues of Aug. 25, 26, 1831; Jan. 20, May 22, July 7, 1841; May 10, 11, 23, 1844, *et seq.*

cratic party. Weed continued to demand equality of treatment for the foreign-born until Nativism, a dying movement, was eclipsed by other issues in the decade before the Civil War.

Weed's interest in education for immigrants was only one aspect of his general sympathy with educational progress. In all probability this sympathy derived partially from the climate of opinion in which he lived and in part from his own lively recollection of the difficulties which had hampered his own quest for knowledge. Be that as it may, he was definitely sympathetic with the development of higher education and repeatedly devoted time and attention to the promotion of educational opportunities for the masses. He had a hand in setting up district school libraries, championed normal schools and teachers' institutes, urged the establishment of superintendents for common schools, and in general stood for the development and perfecting of common-school education in New York state.¹⁷

The projects already mentioned would be enough to denote at least a degree of liberalism in Thurlow Weed's career. There are still other indications that he was not an inveterate opponent of progressive tendencies, and that, especially when political conditions were favorable, he could wave the banner of reform with some vigor. Indeed, in those halcyon days of the 1840's when log-cabin Whiggism was at its height and Horace Greeley was at his elbow, this "somewhat of a radical," as Philip Hone described him, made pronouncements regarding democracy that were not always palatable to his fellow Whigs. "We had always supposed," he wrote in 1845, "that it was the business of '*Democracy*' to legislate for and protect the rights of the mass from the encroachments of a small minority, to whom chance or money had given political power."¹⁸ It was in harmony with this principle that he condemned the great landed proprietors and defended the tenants in the Antirent troubles of the period. It was in harmony with this principle that, in 1845, reversing his stand in 1821, he approved the calling of a convention for the revision of the state's constitution, endorsed the extension of the suffrage, even to colored people, and declared that "Universal Franchise, enlightened by Universal Education, is the surest and strongest reliance for a Republican Government." This brought from James Watson Webb a stern warning against the danger of being infected by a radicalism which might lead straight to that ultimate horror, woman suffrage. But Weed replied by defending his position and asserting that when it came to improving government and purifying society "we follow as a humble individual in the

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Apr. 10, Nov.-Dec., 1835; Aug. 31, Sept. 1, 1836; Feb. 13, 1841; Jan. 30, 1844.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, July 16, 1845.

wake of reform." He would not give women the right to vote, but, he declared in a passage that was pure log-cabin:

Republican Institutions derive truer support from humble Cabins than from stately Mansions. Wealth is too often sordid and grasping. Public virtue resides more with the Middle and Laboring classes. The Young Men, and the Poor Men, cast impulsive and disinterested votes. We go therefore, for the largest liberty in relation to the suffrage.¹⁹

When the convention met in 1846, Weed came out for the popular election of all state officers and he publicly approved the revised constitution, with its provisions for more democratic control of legislation and for the election of state judges.²⁰ Government handouts of money and land drew his attention during this period, and he repeatedly denounced railroad and steamship subsidization for the benefit of speculators and men of wealth and advocated free, limited land grants to actual settlers, with security against alienation for debt.²¹

Such is the record chalked up by Thurlow Weed on the liberal side of the ledger. It gives evidence of a sympathy for the destitute and the oppressed and an interest in a variety of reforms and progressive policies which, with the exception of the New York school law, were politically advantageous as well as eminently desirable. This record furnishes abundant proof that there was a side of Weed's nature which responded with considerable effect to the cry of human need.

A warm heart and a sympathetic spirit were not, however, Weed's only characteristics. He loved power and surrendered it only with the greatest reluctance. This is evident in his unwearied application to the building, oiling, and repairing of political machinery. It is evident in his acceptance and utilization of practices, such as the buying of votes, which his conscience condemned. It is evident in the truculence with which he so often defied opposition and in the bitterness with which he referred in retrospect to the destruction of his hold upon the New York Republican organization during the Civil War. When "The Old Man" struck at those who presumed to thwart his will he struck hard indeed, as one illustration will suffice to show.

In the summer of 1847 Weed was casting about for a candidate for state comptroller. Francis Granger was offered the nomination but refused it. Then Weed conferred with Millard Fillmore, who agreed to accept the post. This was in July, 1847. But trouble soon developed. Avid though Fillmore

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Nov. 10, 14, 1845.

²⁰ *Albany Evening Journal*, June 1, Sept. 11, Oct. 9, 10, 30, 1846. He declared later that experience had justified the elective judiciary.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Dec. 21, 1848; Dec. 28, Mar. 29, 1850; Feb. 24, Mar. 13, 1851.

usually was for office, sober second thought may have induced him to question his grasp of the state's financial problems. Perhaps, as was the case with his friends, he feared that Weed's proffer was a mask for ulterior purpose. Be that as it may, the Buffalonian's associates kept repeating that he was not a candidate, while Fillmore kept silent instead of writing to Weed as he had promised to do in case he changed his mind. This anomalous situation continued until the state convention, to which Nathan Kelsey Hall, Fillmore's law partner, was a delegate, and Weed's patience was exhausted. His account of what followed may be somewhat exaggerated, but it gives a glimpse of "The Dictator" in action. He demanded that Hall clarify Fillmore's position. Hall said that Fillmore was not a candidate but might run if unanimously nominated. To this Weed replied that he was through with trifling; that Fillmore could be nominated, but that he certainly was not going to be "ravished" into accepting the nomination; that it was up to Hall, who could put Fillmore in nomination the next day or, by refusing to do so, could put him out of the running. Hall, Weed grimly remarked, "came to his senses over night."²² The chief had spoken and Fillmore bowed to his will, but the seeds of dislike which had been planted were to bear bitter fruit in the following decade.

Weed took pride in his ability to crack the whip over refractory associates when occasion demanded. He also prided himself upon being possessed of shrewd, practical, hardheaded common sense. His was a literal mind, and withal one extremely sensitive to the possible dangers of change. As a young man he had few visions, and as an old man he dreamed no dreams—save of the past. The concept of natural rights was still important in nineteenth century thought, but Weed had no interest in it as a basis for argument on behalf of Negroes, foreigners, or anyone else. Neither was he one to brave or even to tempt popular wrath merely for the sake of a moral precept. His first reaction to Seward's "higher law" and "irrepressible conflict" speeches was one of criticism, indirect but clearly implied, for it was his obvious conviction that they were not good politics. He never saw the wisdom of Lincoln's emancipation policy, and he believed that black-white equality was forbidden "by laws higher even than political constitutions."²³

Weed's basic principle in politics, as he himself confessed, was "not to

²² Albany *Evening Journal*, July 16, 28, Aug. 4, 1858. This was of course only one of the factors which engendered the break between the Fillmore and the Weed-Seward factions of the Whig party.

²³ Weed had tendencies that at a later day would have been called Comstockian. He rebuked the exhibition of nude statuary and was offended by the "moral laxity" of Victor Hugo and Bulwer Lytton. Edwin Forrest once sued him for \$10,000 because of the *Journal's* officious moral advice. *Ibid.*, Sept. 21, 1835; Jan. 30, 1836; Dec. 18, 1848; Sept. 6, 1851; New York *Commercial Advertiser*, Apr. 3, 1867.

make or control public sentiment, but to ascertain the direction it was taking—and to follow it.”²⁴ This principle, indeed, is the key to a goodly portion of his liberalism, which, in matters of public policy was more often an obeisance to the popular will than any indication of faith in progress and reform. Thus only can be reconciled his bold stand for universal manhood suffrage in the middle 1840’s and the statement in his *Autobiography* (commenting upon his opposition to suffrage extension in 1821), “I feared then, as I have ever since feared, that universal suffrage would occasion universal political demoralization, and ultimately overthrow our government.”²⁵ Thus only can be reconciled his advocacy of free land grants for settlers and his almost pathetic confession a few years later that he had tried for years to believe in a homestead law, but that he could not avoid skepticism as to happiness or prosperity being produced by government handouts.²⁶ There is illumination also in the fact that, during the very period in which Weed was most loudly trumpeting his faith in the masses, Greeley was complaining in private about the way in which “The Dictator” was cold-shouldering projects of social reform, the while he tended to confine the party nominations to the upper social crust.²⁷ Weed was first of all a politician, and a review of his career leads irresistibly to the conclusion that his interest in reforms was chiefly governed by his conception of their popularity with the voters. Where expediency thus predominated there was scant opportunity left for social or political trail blazing, and this trend to the conservative side was fostered by his natural caution, which made him distrustful and suspicious of spirits bolder than his own.

Schemes and schemers for society’s reorganization found Weed cold and disdainful. Fanny Wright, the initiator of a dozen one-woman social uprisings, was in his estimation a “she-wolf,” a being beneath contempt and one who did not even merit fair treatment.²⁸ Free Thinkers were exhibitionists, and he had equally little time for the enthusiasms of the bran-eating Dr. Graham and for Ralph Waldo Emerson’s love of star travel. Robert Dale Owen was a symbol of Agrarianism, Atheism, Leveller Doctrines, and Fanny Wrightism, and Weed would have none of him. Never was this dislike of

²⁴ *Albany Evening Journal*, July 16, 1858. Cf. Thurlow Weed, *Letters from Europe and the West Indies* (Albany, 1866), pp. 387–90.

²⁵ Weed, *Autobiography*, p. 90.

²⁶ *Albany Evening Journal*, Mar. 23, 1854.

²⁷ “You don’t seem yet to understand,” wrote Greeley, “that the men who enjoy most of the hatred of the Aristocracy are the very men whose names will go best before the people. I wish you would let us try it.” Weed MSS. (New York Historical Society), Greeley to Weed, Jan. 3, 1847.

²⁸ *Albany Evening Journal*, June 21, 1830, for the reprint of a letter from Frances Wright to Robert L. Jennings. Weed italicizes such expressions as “my dear Jennings,” thus insinuating the moral depravity of the writer.

reformers better exemplified than when he happened to be traveling on the steamboat *Hendrik Hudson* with Robert Owen the elder. They were befogged for some twelve hours in the river and Owen gave a lecture in the lounge. "Although quite willing that Mr. Owen should talk to all who cared to hear him," Weed wrote later, "being tolerably well satisfied with things as they are, we remained, enjoying our segar and a newspaper in the Barber's Room."²⁹ Nor did this attitude toward society's would-be reorganizers mellow with the years. "Next to a chapter in the Book of Mormon for absurdities, commend us to a political diatribe from Wendell Philipps," Weed snapped as he surveyed the problems of the Reconstruction era, and he obviously regarded a group of English Comteians who were organizing in 1867 to spread the blessings of Positivism as the victims of mental hallucination.³⁰ Such snuffing of the possible upheaval that social change might bring helps to explain Weed's steady opposition to all relaxation of the divorce laws and his equally sustained skepticism about woman suffrage. It likewise clarifies his attitude toward capital and labor.

Weed was mildly sympathetic with labor during his early years. He was active as a journeyman printer in the New York Typographical Society, and his fellow journeymen wrote to him about strikes for higher wages and the "rats" that infested the trade with a freedom which indicates that he shared their emotions and felt close to them in spirit.³¹ The tone of the *Journal* in the 1830's was discreetly friendly to the workingman. Weed seemed to feel that unionization was fully justified where oppression existed, and he denounced the cupidity of employers who sought to lengthen the ten-hour day.³²

But as Weed became more and more closely associated with the big-business interests of his time, with Moses H. Grinnell and Robert B. Minturn, with Erastus Corning, Dean Richmond, Russell Sage, and others, his regard for capitalists became more tender and his attitude toward labor became more stern. Then his relations with the New York merchants and ship-owners became so intimate that he could address them as a class of men who "ask nothing but what is right from legislation," while they, poor bewildered mariners, could characterize him as their "sheet anchor" with the Albany legislature; then he became so firm an ally of the New York Central that its

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Oct. 29, 1845. Weed never met Owen and rebuffed an attempt by the latter to make his acquaintance. Weed Papers, Owen to Weed, Oct. 22, Nov. 10, 1866.

³⁰ New York *Commercial Advertiser*, June 28, Dec. 30, 1867.

³¹ Autograph Collection, University of Rochester, J. B. Van Steenberg to Weed, Nov. 7, 1816; Weed Papers, G. Klinck to Weed, Sept. 30, 1817; J. R. Reynolds to Weed, Aug. 15, 1817.

³² Albany *Evening Journal*, June 10, 1833; June 10, 1835. Cf. also the issues of Dec. 2, 1834; Feb. 16, 28, Apr. 16, 1835; Oct. 9, 1845.

president, Erastus Corning, who was traveling abroad in 1856, could write with perfect confidence, "I do not doubt you will take good care of all matters in which I feel an interest that may come before our Legislature."³³ Labor, on the other hand, became increasingly suspect. Strike violence was sternly condemned and strikes themselves were frowned upon. Labor leagues, agitation for the eight-hour day, and trade unions were mentioned only with scorn. Such pernicious ideas were the result of foreign heresies which were undermining the "true dignity" of American labor. The workers were told that they could only blame their own shortsightedness if they lost their homes through failure to insure them against fire, and that absence of "carpets, a bookcase and even a piano" from a laborer's home might fittingly "be regarded as an indication of improvidence, laziness and bad habits."³⁴ Weed's attitude toward labor and labor organization was definitely hostile during the latter years of his life.

The general observations that may be made regarding the principles of Thurlow Weed divide naturally into two main groups. His generosity, his humanity, his faith in the doctrine of individual freedom as it was generally understood in his day prompted him again and again to denounce injustice and to wage war upon practices and institutions which were hurtful to his fellow human beings. His attempts to relieve suffering, his defense of freedom of speech and freedom of religion, his onslaughts on bigotry, all these bear witness to a side of his life that may truly be called liberal. On the other hand, his repugnance to change, his inherent skepticism, his lack of any real belief in progress made him not only suspicious of all "Hosanna shouters," to use Secretary Hull's term, but also made him suspicious of any social reform that threatened to cut at all deeply into the foundations of existing institutions. He could not abide the fiery enthusiasms of Fanny Wright nor the reforming fervors of Robert Dale Owen; he shrank from arbitrary emancipation of the Negro; and the growth of his trust in the virtue of the

³³ Weed Miscellaneous MSS. (N.Y.H.S.), Weed to the New York merchants, Apr. 28, 1854; Weed Papers, M. H. Grinnell to Weed, Apr. 8, 1858 (?), Erastus Corning to Weed, Feb. 4, 1856. Whig leader Vivus W. Smith of Syracuse complained in 1857 that he did not know where to turn for help against the New York Central, because "our friends at Albany are a good deal mixed up with the Central, and may not like helping in this exigency." E. D. Morgan Papers, V. W. Smith to Morgan, Oct. 24, 1857.

The jerry-built tenements and factories of the 1850's often collapsed with horrible results. An especially terrible case was the Pemberton mill disaster, early in 1860. It evoked from Greeley a demand for building inspection, while James Gordon Bennett denounced "soulless corporations" and called for murder trials. Weed confined himself to deploring the loss of life, describing the catastrophes as "the natural effect of natural causes, which ought, but does not seem to teach reform of a national habit of recklessness." *New York Tribune*, Jan. 12, 1860; *New York Herald*, Jan. 12, 13, 1860; *Albany Evening Journal*, Jan. 11, 13, 1860.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 6, 1859; *New York Commercial Advertiser*, May 31, June 12, July 27, Aug. 30, Nov. 5, 1867; Jan. 4, 8, June 24, 30, 1868.

upper middle class paralleled the growth of his distrust in the rising power of labor.

Gerrit Smith recognized this dualism with clear perception in a letter to Weed when the veteran editor, at sixty-nine, was taking over control of the New York *Commercial Advertiser*. "You will do great good in your new position," wrote Smith, "if you will not let the Conservatism of your cool calculating head have excessive influence over the radicalism of your generous heart."³⁵

There is another aspect of Weed's life that must not be overlooked. As the years went on, years of close contact with all the evil and corruption that ambition and greed create, and as he turned his thoughts somewhat less toward serving others but more and more toward the amassing of those "Golden Dollars" against which his good friend John L. Schoolcraft warned him,³⁶ Weed's earlier tendencies toward humanitarianism moved into the background of his life. The pursuit of wealth became something more than a side issue when he sought it, as he did in the fifties and sixties, through extensive speculations, Harlem "corners," and large-scale cotton operations across the Southern lines. He had always been aware of the dangers of lobbying, but it was not until late in life that he openly professed his ability to lobby without sin.³⁷ He had recognized the evil inherent in vote buying and in 1852 had issued a call for bipartisan remedial action,³⁸ but nothing came of this Macedonian appeal and from then on he accepted the practice as inevitable. He knew that getting money for campaign funds by subserving the unworthy interests of greedy men was ethically reprehensible, but the money had to come from somewhere in 1860, and so he ignored the sinister implications of such action and convinced himself that the New York City railroad laws were good.³⁹

But it would not be safe to assume that Weed had lost all standards in his later years. He shunned the easy road to riches offered by his power over legislation, even though he lived in an age much more complaisant than our own in regard to such jobbery. He was always sensitive to the popular will in matters of government. He sought good men for public office (provided

³⁵ Weed Papers, Smith to Weed, Apr. 14, 1867.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, Schoolcraft to Weed, Feb. 3, 1853. "Your mind for a year past has been active to acculate [accumulate]," Schoolcraft wrote. "You see the Golden Dollars in the distance and the energy of your mind is to enter for the race. You are successful, it sharpens the appetite. The stock list is watched daily for new speculations, you will go on, your only happiness will be gain. How different it was with you for the past 1/4 of a Century. Your happiness was to do good to others." Five years later, the observations of Lewis Benedict, another close friend, bore out Schoolcraft's prophesy. Seward Papers, Lewis Benedict to Seward, Jan. 18, 1858.

³⁷ *Albany Evening Journal*, Aug. 27, 1860.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, Nov. 17, 1852.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, Aug. 21, 27, 1860.

they could command votes), and he could point to a roster of distinguished names—Seward, Fish, Morgan, Dix, and many others—as proof of his desire to put the state in good hands. His services as an organizer of New York state's war effort in 1861 and as an emissary to England and France in 1862 bear witness to his deep and genuine patriotism.⁴⁰ These were, in fact, legitimate causes for satisfaction, and the savagery of his attacks upon his critics derived not at all from hypocrisy but from the conviction that, all things considered, he had led and was leading the good life. "*Offer* all that is right and *demand* all that is due," he wrote to Seward in 1861 when he was searching desperately for a formula that would prevent the secession of the border states. "I do so want it to be right that I shall think of nothing else."⁴¹ With all of his faults and limitations, Thurlow Weed was a man of good will.

University of Rochester

⁴⁰ This statement is based upon a careful examination of the Weed Papers and of the Seward Papers.

⁴¹ Seward Papers, Weed to Seward (1861).

* * * *Notes and Suggestions* * * *

The National Archives Faces the Future

EDWARD G. CAMPBELL*

THE National Archives of the United States was established in 1934, after many years of increasingly persistent agitation by the American Historical Association, government officials, and others for more adequate provision for the administration of the nation's non-current records. The institution was created in the middle of a decade of social and domestic upheaval, which was followed by a period of international chaos and war, and as its tenth birthday approaches the effects of those conditions on the development of the institution are clearly apparent. The history of the National Archives has been one of experimental growth against a background of rapid expansion and alteration of governmental structure and function designed to meet the immediate needs of successive emergencies. Definitive orientation of the agency in its relations to scholarship and to the rest of the government has been impossible.

During this decade, however, certain aspects of the records problems with which the National Archives must deal have become obvious, and they have precipitated a new concept of the proper function of a national archives and a leavening of the ideas that gave impetus to the creation of the institution with the knowledge gained from experience.

In the first place, the sheer physical volume of records produced by the Federal government is reaching astronomical proportions. The present National Archives Building was planned less than fifteen years ago in terms of the volume of government records then in existence and of their existing rate of accumulation. Under the circumstances it seemed reasonable to expect that the National Archives Building would suffice to store the permanently valuable records of the government already extant and those to be created for generations to come. In laying the cornerstone of the building President Herbert C. Hoover had given expression to this belief. As events have since proved, the building is large enough to provide for practically all government records of the period prior to the first World War that are worthy of permanent preservation and for some of those of the first World War period. The great difference between expectation and events has largely resulted from

*The writer is a graduate of Princeton University (1933) and received his doctorate from Columbia University (1938). He is now assistant to the Archivist of the United States.

the expansion of the government and its functions that began in 1933 and has been greatly accelerated by the impact of the present war. In 1936 there were in the District of Columbia more than three million cubic feet of Federal records; five years later, just prior to Pearl Harbor, that figure had been doubled, and present expectations are that by the end of the war there will be more than ten million cubic feet of such records in Washington—placed side by side, four-drawer file cabinets containing that volume of records would stretch for almost 350 miles. Furthermore, within less than a year after the close of the present war probably at least one third of these records will be non-current. Necessary though they are today to the prosecution of the war effort, as the agencies creating them are abolished after the armistice, they will become in many cases unwanted “orphans” unless the National Archives is able to care for them.

By no means should all the records accumulated by these agencies ultimately be transferred to the National Archives for permanent preservation. A large proportion of them are of no lasting value. But the possibility of disposing of records that do not have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant continued preservation by the Federal government depends on numerous factors. It depends in part on the content of the individual documents constituting the files, and the scattered existence of a few valuable papers in a large file may force retention of the entire mass. It depends on the extent to which important information in the files may be duplicated or summarized elsewhere. It depends to a large degree on the importance to the government and its citizens of the transactions documented by the files. These and similar considerations have inevitably forced the archivist to broaden the scope of his interest to include not only files already non-current but also every stage in the creation and use of a file. He must encourage the development of the best records administration practices so that ultimately the documents that should be preserved can easily be segregated from those that should not be preserved. Otherwise in the end the government must pay for the maintenance of huge masses of records in order to keep available the relatively few important papers contained therein.

Many existing files have not been created with any attention to these considerations. And in a busy war agency no one has time or inclination to correct such past errors. So with the end of the war the government will be faced with two alternatives: preserve all these records because among them are a few important documents, or provide the means for a rapid segregation of such documents by trained archivists. The latter alternative means a fairly large initial expense to the government, but the former means a con-

tinuing expenditure that would ultimately dwarf any non-recurring cost of segregation.

As the basis for formulating a postwar archival program designed to meet the problems inherent in the combination of an archival space shortage and an unparalleled accumulation of records, the Archivist of the United States has recently provided for a series of studies of the records problems of many of the war agencies. When the agencies are in process of liquidation there will be little time for the careful investigations necessary to permit evaluation of these records, but the studies now being undertaken will provide much of the necessary information and, under the present statute governing the disposal of government records not worthy of preservation, permission can be obtained from the Congress now to dispose of such records when the agency concerned is liquidated. Vigorous prosecution of this program will immeasurably lessen the confusion that attends abolition of large, scattered governmental units and will enable the Archivist to plan the steps necessary to complete disposition of their records most expeditiously at the proper time.

An important obligation imposed by statute on the Archivist of the United States is that of requisitioning for permanent preservation in the National Archives certain classes or categories of records defined by the National Archives Council. In order to establish a consistent policy in regard to certain types of extremely voluminous records accumulating in field offices, the Archivist has directed that studies be made of the advantages and disadvantages of concentrating these records in Washington. "Housekeeping" records particularly, including procurement, accounting, and civilian personnel files, are scattered over the country in the custody of local offices. Duplicates, triplicates, and even quadruplicates of many of these records exist, but so long as their location and relation to other records is not known, all are likely to be kept or to be destroyed without adequate realization of what is being done. In addition, records of military and naval personnel are not completely centered in Washington. Many such records are kept in the appropriate bureaus in Washington, but related medical records, necessary to the adjudication of pension claims, remain at hospitals and posts throughout the world. The necessity for leaving the records thus separated is being investigated, as well as the relation of these military and naval records to pension records. Not only must governmental agencies use the medical records for their own needs, but there are scientific values in many of them that might be exploited by competent medical scholars if the records were made accessible.

A somewhat similar problem has arisen from the fact that during the war the United States has made aerial mapping film of vast areas of the

world. From pin-point islands in the South Pacific to the shores of the English Channel photographers have made aerial film of areas that might have military or naval importance. Thus far it has been possible to prepare detailed maps from this mass of film only as the necessities of military and naval planning and operations have required them for specific areas. The result is that there are enormous unexploited cartographic opportunities in this film. On the other hand there are peculiar difficulties and high expense involved in attempting to preserve this film. How much of it should be kept? And should that part that is preserved be concentrated in one huge collection, or should the several collections now in the possession of various agencies be kept as separate units? And what are the commercial, political, and scholarly potentialities of these collections? And what, if anything, should the National Archives do to encourage the development in Washington of a cartographical center of world-wide importance?

There are other problems that have arisen from the impact of war on the government's system of record keeping. To what extent should the National Archives preserve purely technical records? The government is one of the most active sponsors of research and invention in the physical sciences, but few archivists are qualified to judge the importance of the records remaining after an experiment has been concluded. Some generally applicable criteria of evaluation must be developed to enable archivists to pass judgment on such records.

Inasmuch as the problem of pure bigness looms so large on the archival postwar horizon, decisions must be made as to the possible reduction of the bulk of large accumulations of records by means of microphotography or of sampling. Neither of these techniques seems at present to offer a complete solution to the problem, but it is very possible that they may be more extensively applicable than is now realized. The Archivist has initiated extensive investigations of the potentialities of both of these techniques. Although almost certainly each proposal involving use of them will have to be judged on its own merits in the final analysis, it may be possible to establish criteria that will provide a basis for making final decisions in specific cases.

The studies now in progress are intended to provide concrete information on the basis of which plans may be made for meeting the specific records problems of the postwar period; perhaps even more important, they are aimed at clarifying the proper functions of the National Archives in the processes of government and at making possible a preliminary determination of the resources in plant, funds, and personnel required to implement those functions.

Another aspect of the experience of the National Archives during the past decade has been the unforeseen developments in the source and nature of the use of records in the custody of the Archivist. In practice the number and complexity of requests made by scholars for the use of records or for information from records for research purposes have been relatively slight as compared to those of government officials in search of precedents or backgrounds for administrative transactions or of individual citizens in search of evidence to substantiate their legal rights. The impact of war has emphasized the fact that in the so-called routine records of the operation of the government in the past lie many of the answers to problems of the present. For the government to function in an emergency without its records of the past is like a victim of amnesia trying to perform a delicate operation. Thus the primary responsibility of the National Archives, insofar as records in the custody of the archivist are concerned, is an integral part of the fundamentally important process of effective documentation of government.

The growing emphasis on the relations of the National Archives to practical processes of government does not mean, however, a neglect of the agency's responsibilities to scholarship. Increasingly the problems of the American people are problems that affect the nation as a whole; increasingly the people are dealing with them through the mechanism of the state, with a consequent broadening and intensification of the government's concern with fundamental questions of social organization and processes. At the same time the maturing of American scholarship amid exigencies that affect the basic structure of our civilization has increased its sense of responsibility with respect to the understanding and solution of the same troubling questions that have now imposed themselves upon public administrators. The widening range of Federal activities in the past few decades has made the records of the Federal government a rich source for the study of every phase of American life. In the effective preservation, organization, and utilization of this store of recorded experience the interests of the scholar and of the administrator are merged.

The National Archives stands at the center of the problem of applying the experience of the government to the problems, existing or arising, that will confront the American people. The physical magnitude and the intellectual complexity of its responsibility are being multiplied by the present war. To the extent that it can prepare itself in resources and in understanding to discharge this responsibility, it will be enabled to reach its greatest usefulness to scholarship and to government alike.

The National Archives

Why the March to Concord?

JOHN RICHARD ALDEN*

PERHAPS no one day in the American calendar has attracted more attention from historians than that of Lexington and Concord, April 19, 1775.¹ The events of that memorable day, except for the impossible question who-fired-the-first-shot, are now fairly well established. But historians, although there has been much writing and speculation upon the subject, have not been able to solve the most fundamental question regarding the outbreak of hostilities: Why did General Thomas Gage send the redcoats to Concord? It is, of course, certain that the troops were ordered to destroy the military stores gathered by the patriots at that village. Many writers (without substantial evidence) have conjectured that they had a second mission, to secure the persons of Samuel Adams and John Hancock. Some have asserted that the general had received directions at an undesignated time to seize these men and that he acted upon the basis of those directions. Most authorities have guessed that Gage put the soldiers in motion upon his own responsibility.² The writer, partly upon the basis of new evidence from the General Thomas Gage Manuscripts,³ hopes to prove that a "Secret" letter from the secretary of state for the colonies, the Earl of Dartmouth, written on January 27, 1775, led Gage to issue marching orders and that Dartmouth's letter was therefore the immediate occasion of the War of Independence. Additional evidence will be offered to show that instructions to apprehend the American leaders were contained in this document but that the general did not attempt to carry them out.

Thomas Gage was sitting on a powder keg all through the winter of

*The author received his training in history at the University of Michigan, where he took his doctorate in 1939. He is at present on the staff of Bowling Green (Ohio) State University.

¹ This article arose from studies made by the writer with the purpose of writing a biography of General Thomas Gage.

² It has not been thought necessary to quote these authorities. The more important are Richard Frothingham, jr., *History of the Siege of Boston* (Boston, 1849), pp. 55-56; George Bancroft, *History of the United States* (10 vols., Boston, 1861-75), VII, 218-19, 281-82; Justin Winsor, comp., *Narrative and Critical History of America* (8 vols., Boston, 1886-89), VI, 122-23; John Fiske, *The American Revolution* (2 vols., Boston, 1901), I, 117-21; Henry Belcher, *The First American Civil War* (2 vols., London, 1911), I, 155, 158-59; Claude H. Van Tyne, *The Founding of the American Republic*, Vol. I, *The Causes of the War of Independence* (Boston and New York, 1922), 451-53; Harold Murdock, *The Nineteenth of April 1775* (Boston, 1923), p. 21; Allen French, *The Day of Concord and Lexington* (Boston, 1925), pp. 53-62; Edward Channing, *A History of the United States* (6 vols., New York and London, 1905-27), III, 154-59; Sir George Trevelyan, *The American Revolution* (4 vols., New York and London, 1926-29), I, 286.

³ In the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan.

1774-75. As governor of Massachusetts and commander in chief of the British army in America he was heavily burdened with the task of executing the Intolerable Acts and upholding the authority of crown and parliament in rebellious Massachusetts. In September, 1774, the "Patriots" in that colony had established a quasi-government of their own and had begun military preparations. Gage had responded by fortifying Boston. He knew that he might well be the official scapegoat unless both peace and the prestige of the imperial government were preserved. He could not jeopardize the claims of that government to sovereignty in America without endangering his hopes of further preferment. In the event of British victory in an armed clash he would be denounced as an Alva by Whigs in England and by "Patriots" in America; in the event of British reverses in battle, which he knew to be not impossible, he would be tossed aside as a bungler.

It is clear that Gage continued to hope against hope until the early summer of 1775 for a peaceful accommodation. In the last phase of the pre-Revolutionary crisis he undoubtedly believed that the best policy was to try to overawe the colonists into submission by a great display of British military power in America. Like the thoroughly prudent and cautious person he was, he shrank from the thought of a trial by battle. Such a conflict was unthinkable, especially to a man happily married to an American woman, but if it should arise, he would do his duty as a soldier. He must have found much consolation in the thought that, while duty required him to recommend vigorous action, the final decision must be made by his superiors. Again and again in the early months of 1775—this fact is of prime importance—he declared that he was waiting for "the determination from home."⁴ Gage aptly described his position to his friend Viscount Barrington on February 10:

I have acted for the best, and think in the end I shall prove that I have hitherto observed a conduct, the most salutary, by which the prejudices of the people, are in great measure removed, and the hot headed leaders baffled in their projects. Your next dispatches will probably require a different conduct, and I shall wait for them impatiently as I conclude they will require me to make many preparations to act offensively; for to keep quiet in the town of Boston only, will not terminate affairs; the troops must march into the country.⁵

⁴ Statements to this effect are to be found in Gage to Governor Wentworth, Feb. 6, 1775; Gage to Guy Carleton, Mar. 8, 1775, also Mar. 16, 1775, Gage MSS.; Gage to Viscount Barrington, Feb. 10, 1775 (Private), also Mar. 28, 1775 (Private), Clarence E. Carter, ed., *The Correspondence of General Thomas Gage . . . 1763-1775* (2 vols., New Haven, 1931-33), II, 669, 671-72. Hugh, Earl of Percy, who held a command under Gage at Boston, declared on April 8, 1775, "The Genl. however has received no acct. whatever from Europe, so that [on] our side no steps of any kind can be taken as yet." Charles K. Bolton, ed., *Letters of Hugh Earl Percy from Boston and New York, 1774-1776* (Boston, 1902), p. 48.

⁵ *Gage Corr.*, II, 669.

As Allen French has shown,⁶ Gage was exceedingly well informed after February regarding the activities of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress and its various committees and also concerning the military supplies collected at Concord and other places. Vital political information, as Mr. French has proved conclusively, came to him from Dr. Benjamin Church, jr. Many data regarding the military equipment, contained in curious memoranda written in absurdly bad French and now in the Gage Manuscripts, seem to have been obtained through another competent spy, whose name remains unknown.⁷ Other informants, particularly Captain John Brown and Lieutenant John De Berniere, who made at least two scouting trips toward Concord, completed the picture. If Gage acted upon his own initiative, as most writers have believed, why did he wait so long? Again, if he acted without orders, why did he not seize the patriot leaders before they should learn of the strong stand taken by the British government, before they should seek safety by flight? The only logical answer that can be made to these questions, as the documents testify so abundantly, is that he was waiting for instructions.

As news from England seeped across the Atlantic through unofficial sources in the first days of April that the home government would continue its policy of severity in regard to America, Gage laid plans for the expedition to Concord. Those plans began to take form at least as early as April 5, when Gage wrote to Vice-Admiral Samuel Graves, whose headquarters were also in Boston: "I shall at the same time be obliged to you for your opinion of the number of troops that the boats belonging to your squadron in the harbour would be able to take on." Graves must have realized that Gage desired the use of the boats to carry troops across the bay. He replied: "I have received your Excellency[']s letter . . . & will do myself the honor of calling upon your Excellency tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock."⁸ We may conjecture that the general and the admiral held their consultation on the morning of April 6. Shortly afterward watchful Americans observed royal seamen repairing the boats and tying them to the ships so as to be ready for instant use. It required no great insight to infer that Gage was preparing to send a body of regulars across the bay and to Concord. On April 7, Dr. Joseph Warren sent Paul Revere to the Provincial Congress at Concord with the news that British soldiers would probably march upon that place within

⁶ *General Gage's Informers* (Ann Arbor, 1932), chaps. 1 and v.

⁷ The memoranda, dated Mar. 9, Mar. 11, Apr. 6, and Apr. 14, may have been written in the French language because Gage had no cipher at the time. Mr. French used all the intelligence documents in this collection except the memoranda of Apr. 6 and Apr. 14, to which he did not have access. As will be shown, the latter document contains important information.

⁸ Gage to Graves, Apr. 5, 1775; Graves to Gage, Apr. 5, 1775, Gage MSS.

a few days. Meanwhile, after receiving the news from England, the prime malcontents in Boston (except Warren) had left the city. At the time Gage did not know precisely the reason for the exodus of the Boston chiefs of the "faction." Afterward he came to believe that they had obtained early and accurate information from London regarding the decision of the home government.⁹ Gage himself did not learn that decision officially until April 14, when a red-faced, stout young army captain named Oliver De Lancey, a cousin of Mrs. Gage, reached Boston on board H. M. S. *Nautilus* with dispatches from the cabinet.

While Gage waited anxiously in Massachusetts, his superiors in Great Britain had moved slowly toward the fateful determination. As early as December 10, H. M. S. *Falcon* was set aside for the purpose of carrying the orders to Massachusetts, but the *Falcon* did not actually leave British waters until three months later. Sometime after mid-January the king and cabinet agreed upon instructions for Gage.¹⁰ Lord Dartmouth embodied these in a "Secret" dispatch dated January 27. Because of the fact, however, that Gage was ordered to take drastic action, the letter was apparently retained in England until the temper of a newly elected house of commons could be properly analyzed.¹¹ The new house supported the cabinet by heavy majorities. Almost at the moment when Dartmouth signed his letter, the commons refused to receive the petition of the First Continental Congress. Early in February an address to the throne declaring Massachusetts to be in rebellion was approved; and a bill restricting the trade of New England to Great Britain and the British West Indies and barring the New Englanders from the Newfoundland fisheries obtained favorable consideration. Enlargement of the army in America and the sending of three major generals to assist Gage were other measures which received assent. Lord North's Conciliatory Resolution, although it conceded nothing to the colonists except that they might be permitted to contribute to the expenses of empire by acts of their own assemblies rather than by acts of parliament, was condemned as a sign of weakness by many supporters of the ministry and was eventually passed on February 20 only because of strong pressure on the part of Lord North.

Exactly when Dartmouth sent his instructions aboard ship for transmission to America cannot be determined at this time. But he was able to enclose copies of the various acts and addresses of parliament and of other

⁹ *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Fourth Series, IV, 371-72.

¹⁰ Peter O. Hutchinson, ed., *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson* (2 vols., Boston, 1884-86), I, 362-63.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, 364; William Knox, "Secret of proceedings respecting America in the new Parliament 1774 & 5," William Knox MSS., p. x. in the William L. Clements Library.

documents from the cabinet describing events in London as late as February 22. To assure safe arrival in America, the original dispatch, with the enclosures, was placed on board the *Falcon*, and a duplicate, with the enclosures and another letter from Dartmouth to Gage of February 22, was entrusted to Captain De Lancey, who was sailing upon army business to Boston in the *Nautilus*. Dartmouth's instructions were still further delayed in transit by unfavorable winds, which may be said to have postponed the War of Independence for many days. When William Knox read a copy of the fateful dispatch to Thomas Hutchinson on March 22, Hutchinson realized that the die was cast, and he made inquiries regarding the location of the two ships. On March 12 the *Falcon* was at Torbay and the *Nautilus* at Plymouth.¹² However, the *Nautilus* set sail on March 13 and arrived at Boston on April 14. Two days later the *Falcon* reached harbor.¹³

It is a surprising fact that the "Secret" dispatch has hitherto been almost ignored by historians. Although George Bancroft discusses part of the text, he fails to consider the impact of the letter upon Gage. Allen French notes that Dartmouth seemed to urge drastic action, but he is unduly impressed by certain phrases of the minister, a "saving clause" to the effect that Gage might exercise his own discretion in the event that the situation had changed in Massachusetts; moreover, he confuses this document with a letter written by the general to the secretary of state on January 18 and therefore arrives at the erroneous conclusion that Dartmouth's orders reached Boston before March 18.¹⁴

While it is true that Dartmouth's letter informs the general that "in a situation where every thing depends so much upon the events of the day, and upon local circumstances, your conduct must be governed very much by your own judgement and discretion," it is clear that he desired Gage to act, and to act promptly and decisively, unless the state of affairs in Massachusetts had greatly altered. He states that Gage's reports "show a determination in the people to commit themselves at all events in open rebellion" and that "in such a situation, force should be repelled by force"; he informs the general that considerable reinforcements are on the way from Great Britain; he tells him to encourage the formation of a corps of Tories; he hints that he is dissatisfied because Gage has remained inactive in Boston and that "It is

¹² *Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson*, I, 416-17.

¹³ A docket upon the duplicate dispatch in the Gage MSS. indicates that it was received via the *Nautilus* on April 14; a similar docket upon the original letter states that it was received via the *Falcon* on April 16. The arrival of the dispatches on these dates is confirmed in the *Essex Gazette*, Apr. 18, 1775. See also *Gage Corr.*, I, 396.

¹⁴ Bancroft, VII, 218-19, 281-82; French, pp. 53-62.

hoped that this large reinforcement to your army will enable you to take a more active & determined part"; he asserts roundly that "the authority of this kingdom must be supported, & the execution of its laws inforced"; he states that since the people in three New England colonies seem "determined to cast off their dependence upon the government of this kingdom, the only consideration that remains is, in what manner the force under your command may be exerted to defend the constitution & to restore the vigour of government"; he thinks that

a smaller force now, if put to the test, would be able to encounter them with greater probability of success than might be expected from a greater army, if the people would be suffered to form themselves upon a more regular plan, to acquire confidence from discipline, and to prepare those resources without which every thing must be put to the issue of a single action.

He declares that the "king's servants" believe that "the first & essential step . . . toward re-establishing government, would be to arrest the principal actors and abettors in the Provincial Congress," if that body had reassembled (which, of course, it had); he avers that "though such a proceeding should be, according to your own idea of it, a signal for hostilities yet . . . it will surely be better that the conflict should be brought on, upon such ground, than in a riper state of rebellion"; he instructs Gage, if necessary, to use force to prevent the patriots from seizing ships bringing goods to American ports contrary to the non-importation agreements; and he scolds the general for permitting the patriots to drill in Faneuil Hall. Over and over again Dartmouth tells Gage to act decisively.¹⁵

It is evident that Gage, smarting under criticism which had been leveled against him because he had been cautious and because he had proposed temporizing while making large-scale military preparations,¹⁶ quickly construed the duplicate copy of Dartmouth's letter as an order to march, in view of the fact that there had been no change in conditions in Massachusetts. He was forced to consider North's Conciliatory Resolution as window-dressing which did not affect his confidential instructions, especially since Dartmouth's letter of February 22 (also received on April 14)¹⁷ declared again that those instructions were to be executed. But what action could he take? By an interesting coincidence he received important information from one of his spies,

¹⁵ The original and the duplicate copy of this dispatch, with their enclosures, are in the Gage MSS. The original has been printed in *Gage Corr.*, II, 179-83. In justice to Bancroft and French, it should be noted that they had access only to copies of these papers from the British Public Record Office. The dockets upon the letters in the Gage MSS. have been helpful in settling the crucial point of the dates of their arrival.

¹⁶ See *Gage Corr.*, II, 669, 684. ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 184-86.

whose name is unknown, on the very day of the arrival of the *Nautilus*. The spy reported that Revere had carried the warning of Gage's preparations for the expedition to Concord to that village on April 7, that the archrebels were exceedingly alarmed and divided in their counsels, and that they were attempting to conceal most of their military equipment in and near the village. He gave the locations of the hiding places chosen by the patriots and offered to furnish a guide for the troops, should they be sent out.¹⁸ Here was an opportunity to strike the sudden and perhaps decisive blow that Dartmouth desired. There was small likelihood that rebellion could be prevented by seizing some of the American leaders, for the disease was too widespread. Besides, an attempt to capture them would place Great Britain in the position of the aggressor. And the attempt could easily fail. On the other hand, the troops *might* be able to reach Concord and to destroy the military equipment. The patriots *might* refrain from hostilities, either through fear of the consequences or through a desire to avoid the role of the aggressor. If the expedition peacefully accomplished its mission, the more timid Americans *might* well be frightened into obedience. If war should unfortunately begin as a result of the expedition—well, it would begin in any case, and the colonists would be burdened with the responsibility for opening hostilities. Such an expedition had another great advantage for Gage: it was well within his instructions.¹⁹ On April 14, as American observers did not fail to note, Gage removed the grenadiers and light infantry of his command from their routine duties to prepare them for the march to Concord.²⁰

¹⁸ Memorandum of intelligence [Apr. 14, 1775], Gage MSS.

¹⁹ No explicit statement by Gage has been found to the effect that he had commands to use the troops, probably because it was never necessary for him to make such a statement. However, his report on the occurrences of April 18–19 to Dartmouth, written on April 22, mentions the flight of the leaders of the "faction" from Boston early in the month, indicates that the minister's letters to February 22 were received by the *Nautilus* and the *Falcon* on the 14th and 16th respectively, and then proceeds immediately to a narrative of events. *Gage Corr.*, I, 396–97. This document was clearly intended to tell Dartmouth how his instructions were carried out. It is altogether likely that Gage thought it unwise to mention specifically his "Secret" orders, especially since his report might fall into the wrong hands. At the time Gage was trying to place the onus of beginning hostilities upon the patriots; his orders would have proved that Britain had planned to act aggressively.

That Gage's mind followed the lines indicated is suggested by a letter from him to Governor Trumbull of Connecticut, May 3, 1775, Gage MSS., printed in Peter Force, ed., *American Archives*, Fourth Series (6 vols., Washington, 1837–46), II, 482–83, and by Gage's cautious nature. The fact that he had not been sent precise directions to destroy the stores does not prove that Gage exceeded his orders. His course of action was more moderate than that sanctioned by the cabinet. It should be recalled that the cabinet did not even know of the existence of the stores at Concord until letters from Gage of February and March reached London.

²⁰ *Collections of the New-York Historical Society For the Year 1883* (The Kemble Papers), p. 42; Elbridge H. Goss, *The Life of Colonel Paul Revere* (2 vols., Boston, 1891), I, 184. John Howe, who describes himself as a spy employed by Gage, seems to indicate in a journal published many years after the event that the general decided on April 13 to send out the troops on the 18th. Howe states that he returned from a scouting trip to Boston at 2:00 A. M. on April 12

Lieutenant Colonel Francis Smith, who was chosen to command the expeditionary force, did not receive his instructions until three days later. The delay is probably largely explained by the fact that Gage thought it wise to prevent concerted action on the part of the Americans by waiting until the members of the Provincial Congress should leave Concord as the result of a recess planned for April 15. No doubt he also thought it prudent to wait until he had seen other papers he knew to be en route from England, including the original of the "Secret" letter. There was naught in these documents to cause Gage to change his plans. A draft of the general's instructions to Smith and the instructions themselves²¹ indicate that Smith was furnished the information collected by Gage's spies regarding the military equipment at Concord and that he was ordered to locate and destroy it. These papers, Smith's report to Gage,²² and Gage's report to Dartmouth on the action of April 19²³ carry no mention of a design to capture the patriot leaders; nor do accounts of the events of the day by Americans on the spot describe any attempt by the soldiers to apprehend them. Intelligence memoranda in the Gage Manuscripts do not even refer to the presence of Samuel Adams and John Hancock at Lexington from April 15 to 19. Dr. Joseph Warren actually remained unmolested in Boston until the morning of April 19 and then left the city to join his friends.²⁴

Although Gage's reports to his superiors had possibly contributed in small degree to the decision of the government of Great Britain to appeal to force

to report, that he saw Gage twice the next morning, and that he had a further conference with the general at 9:00 A. M. the following day. During the third conference, according to Howe, he was ordered to establish contact with Tories outside the city in order that the latter might take steps to prevent the minutemen from rising on April 18-19. However, it seems possible that 2:00 A. M. on April 12 in the journal was actually 2:00 A. M. on April 13, and that Howe was informed of Gage's plan at 9:00 A. M. on April 14. It should be added that Howe's journal could hardly have been kept while he was engaged in spying outside Boston, and that it was retouched before publication. *A Journal Kept by Mr. John Howe while He Was Employed as a British Spy, during the Revolutionary War; also while He Was Engaged in the Smuggling Business during the Late War* (Concord, 1827, photocopy, William L. Clements Library), pp. 21-25.

²¹ Gage MSS.

²² Apr. 22, 1775, *ibid.*

²³ Cited above.

²⁴ Gage hinted in his report of April 22 to Dartmouth that he had not tried to apprehend the American leaders. The same hint is given in a later statement by Gage: "On the arrival of two vessels at Marblehead, on the 8th of April, 1775, an unusual hurry and commotion was perceived among the disaffected. It being on a Sunday morning, Dr. Cooper, a notorious rebel, was officiating in his meeting-house, and, on notice given him, pretended sudden sickness, went home, and sent to another clergyman to do his duty in the evening. He with every other chief of the faction, left Boston before night, and never returned to it. The cause, at the time unknown, was discovered on the 14th of said month, when a vessel arrived with government despatches, which contained directions to seize the persons of certain notorious rebels. It was too late. They had received timely notice of their danger, and were fled." *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Fourth Series, IV, 372.

as the final arbiter, that decision was contained in Dartmouth's "Secret" letter, which was therefore the spark that kindled the War of Independence.²⁵

Bowling Green State University

²⁵ It is significant that when William Knox read a copy of the "Secret" dispatch to Thomas Hutchinson on March 22, Hutchinson, an experienced interpreter of official papers, realized immediately that hostilities could be expected, unless the patriots humbled themselves. Hutchinson also reports that a week later Dartmouth seemed "very apprehensive that the New England people will resist the King's troops, and does not know but some action between them will be best." He wrote prophetically to Boston on April 10: "I cannot yet believe Mr Adams will be able to persuade our people to so irrational a step as to form themselves into a body to oppose the King's troops. Before this reaches you it will be determined." *Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson*, I, 416-17, 419, 428. After receiving the news of Lexington and Concord, Dartmouth displayed some inclination to avoid responsibility for the instructions he had sent out. When the shrewd William Franklin asked why Gage, a man of "distinguished character, and well-known prudence," precipitated a conflict before the Conciliatory Resolution could be presented to the American legislatures, the minister rather vaguely but ungenerously implied that Gage had been at fault. William A. Whitehead, et al., eds., *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New Jersey* (36 vols., Newark, 1880-), X, 592-93, 645-46. But neither Dartmouth nor any other member of the cabinet dared to censure Gage publicly in England for sending out the troops. Influential persons familiar with the character of the general knew that he would neither disobey orders nor act without them. See Lord George Germain to Lord Suffolk [June 16 or 17, 1775], Sackville-Germain MSS., III, William L. Clements Library; [George Selwyn to Lord Carlisle], Aug. 4 [1775], *Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Fifteenth Report, Appendix, Part V, 284. Of course, Gage could have produced the "Secret" dispatch in his own defense.

* * * * *Reviews of Books* * * * *

General History

A HUNDRED YEARS OF MEDICINE. By C. D. Haagensen and Wyndham E. B. Lloyd. (New York: Sheridan House. 1943. Pp. xii, 444. \$3.75.)

THE story is told of a well-known professor of medicine who always at the year's end says to his class: "Gentlemen, I have done my best to give you the latest and most accurate medical facts. But now I must warn you that before you have been long in practice one half of what I have told you may be proved untrue. Unfortunately, gentlemen, I cannot tell you which half."

A Hundred Years of Medicine makes the doctor's meaning and his purpose abundantly clear. Written in its original English edition by Dr. Lloyd, a specialist in public health, and extensively rewritten for this American edition by Dr. Haagensen, surgeon and pathologist at Columbia University's School of Medicine, the book is a layman's introduction to the high lights of recent medical history. And the reader not previously acquainted with its contents is likely to be startled to learn how much of today's medical and surgical practice is a matter of recent discovery.

After a brief review of knowledge and theory in earlier centuries, the authors trace the major developments in all the principal fields of medicine and surgery. There are, among others on specific diseases and specialties, chapters on the germ theory, the new chemotherapy, vitamins, new aids to diagnosis, and the control of pain, surgical infection, hemorrhage, and shock. A short concluding section on "The Social Aspects of Medicine" suggests the meaning of all this activity for the practitioner, the man in the street, and society as a whole. It helps to explain why "the right to adequate medical care" properly finds a place in the President's bill of rights for economic democracy.

This record of medicine's miracles and miracle-workers, quietly and impersonally written though it is, can scarcely fail to provoke wonder at the professional historians' lazy neglect of medical history. Is there any valid reason why students of European history should be less familiar with the work of Lister, Erlich, Koch, or Virchow than with that of Bismarck, Richelieu, or Charlemagne? Or any excuse for one's thumbing American history texts in vain for even a mention of such men as Ephraim McDowell, Edward Trudeau, George Minot, or William Halsted? Are not the achievements of our medical heroes a significant and pride-worthy part of the common heritage, as pregnant as any others with import for the public welfare?

University of Minnesota

HELEN CLAPESATTLE

THE PASSING OF THE EUROPEAN AGE: A STUDY OF THE TRANSFER OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION AND ITS RENEWAL IN OTHER CONTINENTS. By *Eric Fischer*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xiii, 214. \$2.50.)

THIS is a small book on a large subject. It is obviously inspired by the present conflict between Nazi-controlled Europe and the "extra European" powers: the United States, the British Empire, and Soviet Russia.

The thesis of the author is that Western civilization has been developing outside of Europe, which, for many centuries, had been its supreme center. These non-European centers of Western civilization have become so strong that they are now more important and more vital than Europe itself. In the second World War Germany is making a desperate, but futile, effort to restore Europe's old position as the center of Western civilization. Therein lies her "tragedy," according to the author. With the victory of the "extra European" powers the "Age of Europe" will have passed into history.

Special chapters are devoted to the United States, Latin America, the British Dominions, and Asiatic Russia, which, according to the author, are now the rising centers of Western civilization. Although these chapters are fairly short, they are closely packed with detailed facts, political, economic, and cultural, to illustrate the central theme of the book. However, the facts cited are too obvious and sometimes too trivial to give much weight to so tremendous a generalization as the passing of the European age. The leading non-European center of Western civilization is the United States. Though European in origin American civilization "has branched away from every European variety of that civilization" and is now imposing its version on Europe itself. The author gives many instances of the Americanization of Europe, such as the spread of mass production, of skyscrapers, of Hollywood movies, and of juvenile reformatories. He asserts that the new nations that appeared after the first World War adopted the American constitution as their political model. This is an error; only the constitution of Czechoslovakia showed American influence. He also asserts that it was the influence of America that brought about the success of woman suffrage in Europe. This is likewise an error; it was England, not America, that was the driving force of the movement for equal suffrage in Europe.

In order to write a book on a great subject one should either devote years of study and produce a work of Spenglerian proportions, or, following the example of Montesquieu's *Persian Letters*, he should write a small volume, packed with philosophic observations and tingling satire. The author has done neither.

City College, New York

J. SALWYN SCHAPIRO

THE MIND AND FAITH OF JUSTICE HOLMES: HIS SPEECHES, ESSAYS, LETTERS, AND JUDICIAL OPINIONS. Selected and edited with Introduction and Commentary by Max Lerner. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1943. Pp. xvii, 474. \$4.00.)

HERE is an important job admirably performed. No book gives non-lawyers a better understanding of the way judges shape the governmental and business structure of the United States. And the judicial task is illustrated by one of the most interesting minds our country has ever produced. In closing his thoughtful summary of Holmes's career and personality, Mr. Lerner says, "Holmes is a great man regardless of whether he was a great justice"; and then he sets forth a wealth of selections from Holmes's writings to show why he was both. Judicial opinions in Massachusetts and the Supreme Court supply, of course, the largest portion of the material, but Holmes's thinking and emotions are also revealed by essays, passages from his one regular book, *The Common Law*, a number of letters, and several speeches ranging from early addresses commemorating the Civil War to his radio talk to the nation on his ninetieth birthday.

Thus the editor's skill in sifting the voluminous mass of Holmes's writings allows him to be seen from all sides through the reader's own eyes. Mr. Lerner has used his eyes too. The most valuable feature of his book is the introductory notes before each of the judicial opinions. These are sometimes longer than the quotations from Holmes, and wisely so. They show the reader the issue to be decided, the divergence of Holmes from other justices, contemporary response to the decision, and the long-time influence of Holmes's views. There has been altogether too much unmixed adulation in most writing about Holmes, so that it is refreshing to find Mr. Lerner ready to make adverse comments whenever he thinks them deserved. Also he is quick to point out serious inconsistencies in Holmes's reasoning. In consequence, this book aids us greatly in giving Holmes his rightful place in the development of American law.

Although Mr. Lerner is a political scientist and not a professionally trained lawyer, he knows his way around. Lawyers will enjoy the book as much as laymen and will probably profit from it even more. Still, there is need for a strictly legal appraisal of Holmes's judicial work. His views of private law had an important influence on his constitutional decisions, which Mr. Lerner, quite naturally, sometimes fails to notice. A very interesting study might be made by running Holmes's favorite legal principles back from his Supreme Court cases into his Massachusetts opinions, his *Common Law*, and articles in legal periodicals, and perhaps into his annotations to Kent's *Commentaries* at the age of thirty-two. A lawyer, too, is struck by Holmes's readiness to use a few principles to solve all sorts of problems. For example, the idea that if A is entitled to refuse all privileges whatever, then A can grant such a privilege howsoever and to whomsoever A pleases, turns up in all sorts of places—the burdensome taxation of foreign insurance companies, price restrictions by patent-medicine manufacturers, and the

arbitrary denial of permits to speak on Boston Common. Perhaps he oversimplified the law.

Moreover, we need to know why some able lawyers do not consider Holmes a great judge. This does not mean that they deny his intellectual ability. Their objection is the difficulty of knowing just what he did decide in a particular case. A lawyer has to advise clients how to shape their transactions to satisfy the law as laid down by the Supreme Court, and when litigation arises he has to relate the case at bar to previous decisions. Here he did not get from Holmes the help which a practitioner is accustomed to receive from judicial opinions. Also lower court judges, who are obligated to decide very many cases in accordance with a few Supreme Court decisions, had difficulty in learning from Holmes's opinions what they were supposed to do. In a sense, Holmes's greatness interfered with his satisfactory performance of the useful service performed by less brilliant judges. One of his *aperçus* might forecast what the law would be in ten or twenty years, but the practitioner and the district judge often have to use a Supreme Court opinion next year. So they prefer a justice who plainly maps the path through the bushes right ahead to the genius who locates a future highroad.

Mr. Lerner's comparison between Holmes and Marshall (p. xlix) suffers a bit from a similar emphasis on a judge's thinking to the exclusion of his accomplishment. "Marshall's reputation," he says, "stands or falls with the vested interests he defended and with the viability of the system of economic relations that leans heavily on his constitutional interpretations." There was much more to Marshall than economic royalism. His reputation stands with the nation he created, along with Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton. He got the country going, insofar as a judge could. Without him the Constitution might have remained much more like a piece of paper. At any rate, we should be living under a very different national government from what we now have. Once anything is started, it is easy to forget how hard it was to start it. Holmes's task was a big one but not so big as that.

Finally, there are some problems about Holmes's emotions and general thinking which perhaps cannot be cleared up until Mark Howe gives us his authorized and eagerly awaited biography. How much was Holmes interested in the way people behave? After all this is the stuff of the law. His letters to Pollock are not very good as letters. They have little of that power to heighten ordinary day-to-day events which constitutes the fascination of the correspondence of Mme de Sevigné or Lady Mary Wortley Montagu or Edward Fitzgerald. More of such prosaic preoccupations with the actions of men might have kept Holmes from suggesting that the merger of the Great Northern and Northern Pacific Railways should be treated like "two small exporting grocers" going into partnership. And was Holmes somewhat lacking in sympathy? He was devoted to his old friends and regimental associates and delightfully kind to able young men, but did he care deeply about many individuals? In particular, was it hard for him to identify

himself with men in the mass or to put himself in the place of persons he did not know well? His numerous speeches glorifying war because it produces some brave soldiers seem blind to the widespread demoralization and bereavement. One felt in his presence a little hardness toward failures in life, and *Sunt lacrimae rerum* was probably not one of his favorite quotations. A man who loved to see any small boy go swimming might have expressed more reluctance about letting a landowner escape liability for a large water-filled cellar-hole containing chemicals, which killed two youngsters camping nearby who had plunged in without getting any warning. I do not blame Holmes for disliking to bury himself in statistics of the textile industry, as Brandeis advised, but did he sense the numerous anxieties of either a millworker or an employer? Brandeis could. He seemed to know and to feel all that was going on, whether it was the whirl of machinery, the multiplicity of bargainings, the purchase of necessities, the difficulty of finding cash for the next payroll, the sufferings of a persecuted or war-torn population. Did Holmes leave all this out of his letters to Pollock merely because they did not interest Sir Frederick, or was it because they did not interest Holmes? The economic upheavals of the nineties, the first World War, the Russian Revolution—he views them with a detached interest at best, as if Montesquieu had survived to gaze calmly at the fall of the Bastille.

Yet if Holmes outside his judicial work was like a cultivated and gracious aristocrat of the *ancien régime*, more interested in Turgot as writer than Turgot the baffled reorganizer of muddled finance, no need to repine. Aristocrats have been very, very scarce in the United States. What a miracle that one of them should have come into the high position for which he was exactly fitted at just the right time and stayed there for twenty years beyond the normal span of life to guide the nation with the insight of a philosopher through a host of problems which were wholly unforeseen when he was young.

Harvard University

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.

JAN SMUTS: A BIOGRAPHY. By F. S. Crafford. (Garden City: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 1943. Pp. xi, 322. \$3.50.)

FOR more than a generation the popular picture of the Boer War on the continent of Europe and in America was that of the British colossus hammering the puny Dutch republics of South Africa into submission. Yet the meaning of the Boer War in modern history is not so much given by what Great Britain did to the Boers as by what the Boers did to Great Britain. For one thing it helped to shatter the complacency of late Victorian England and led to the series of constructive and generous concessions that created the Union of South Africa and found their reward in the loyalty of the Commonwealth in two world wars.

To British statesmanship in quest of a policy of co-operation with the defeated Boers, Jan Christiaan Smuts, the Boer leader, was a great asset. Part of the great

reputation of Smuts is founded upon the deep gratitude felt in Great Britain toward a man who put aside rancor and stepped beyond defeat, so that he and his followers might be free of the burden and hindrance of a bitter past. Without losing dignity himself he did more than any other man to give dignity and aim to a British policy that might otherwise have appeared penitential, apologetic, and aimless. British opinion gladly heaped honors and praise upon a man who did so much to confuse and confute hostile critics of colonial and imperial policy. A share of Smuts's great reputation is thus a gift from a grateful people. But the gift was not disproportionate to his own genuine stature.

The first task of the biographer of Smuts is to strip him of the praise of admirers and to cleanse him of the calumny of his enemies, for he is hated with a bitter and unrelenting hate. Once that is done the essential problems of his life emerge. What is the relation between the Smuts of brilliant speeches on international affairs and the Smuts who has contributed not a single great idea to the burning issue of native affairs in his own country? Is the *leitmotiv* of his life a lust for power so great that he has cut into the flesh of his own people in order to gain and hold it? Mr. Crafford holds this view, although he does not prove it. Can his holistic view of life be given as an explanation of his attitude toward the British Commonwealth of Nations? This book answers few of these questions and none of them decisively.

The task of any biographer is made arduous by the need to work constantly in two dimensions: in the dimension of the personal and individual and in the dimension of the society and period in which his subject lived. The first requirement of a successful biography is an organic and convincing bond between "Life" and "Times." From the historian's point of view the most serious single criticism of this book is the preponderance of "Life" over "Times." The single figure of Smuts bulks disturbingly between the reader and important events in South Africa and the empire. The result is a deepening of the enigmas in his personality and action. For example, the problems which brought about the eclipse of Smuts in the Pact elections of 1924 were the great and abiding problems of native labor and the Color Bar, of low-grade mines and the gold standard, of poor whites and tariffs. Yet Mr. Crafford passes casually over these problems, or hints at them with perfunctory clichés about capitalism, trade unionism, and the Chamber of Mines.

On the difficult problems of Dominion status and imperial relations Mr. Crafford is not very helpful and sometimes even careless and misleading. He does bring out skillfully the iron will, the personal daring, and magnificent strategic sense of General Smuts. The book shows a firm resolve to be objective and fair. But it never halts long enough in its movement to study its subject fully engaged in some important issue. Smuts is whisked, for example, from East Africa to England in 1917, and all one gets to see is Smuts striding brilliantly from the imperial cabinet to coal strikes, to Flanders, always the master of any problem,

dwarfing most men, and almost obscuring Lloyd George himself. But at no point is thought related fully to decision, decision to act, and act to its consequence.

As a biography written about an important figure in a time of crisis it is certain to be widely read. Mr. Crafford has a good eye for the high lights of Smuts's career. Anecdote and descriptive comment make a readable book. Yet he has not written the book on Smuts for which the student is waiting. Little use seems to have been made of parliamentary papers or debates, and it appears that the author has relied too heavily on newspapers and editorial comment. Documentation is casual and insufficient.

Cornell University

C. W. DE KIEWIET

LESSONS OF MY LIFE. By *Lord Vansittart*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1943. Pp. xxii, 281. \$3.00.)

ONE suspects that if this book had been written by anyone less distinguished than Lord Vansittart it would never have seen the light of day. Even in wartime a certain decorum is customary in writing of the enemy. Particularly, to their credit be it said, is this true of Englishmen. But this book is so replete with venomous slurs and nasty insinuations that it reminds one constantly of Dr. Goebbels. A few illustrations taken at random will suffice to prove this point. "Another lesson of my life," says the author, "has been that eight Germans out of ten have always thought it not only legitimate but laudable to take every advantage however unfair in every walk of life." "The German nation has always been animated by the spirit of assent to evil." Rommel is a "cur who ran away and callously, egotistically, Germanically left his Italian allies in the lurch." "There is no such word as 'gentleman' in German, for the word denotes some consideration for others."

Quotations like the above reflect the animosity and hate with which his lordship regards not simply Nazis but German people. Prime Minister Churchill does not speak thus of Rommel, quite the contrary. As for the word "gentleman," one might as well argue that French family life is nonexistent because there is no word for "home" in French. Hymns of hate inevitably set in motion counter-currents of sympathy, as may be noted this very day in England. A book like this defeats its own purpose.

Lord Vansittart argues in striking Nazi fashion—he turns racialism upside down. You cannot have *Herrenvolk* without having inferiors, and in this book the Germans are certainly such, for they are portrayed as spiritually degraded, as Ishmaels and outcasts for whom there is no hope except in a long period of re-education, presumably conducted by the real *Herrenvolk*, the British, the Americans, the Russians, *et al.*

Now, most of us agree with Vansittart that the German army must be defeated

decisively and that Germany be policed for a time by the United Nations. But re-education is another matter. Certainly the results will prove disastrous if men like his lordship are to control it, men who lump together in the same low circle of hell almost every German of prominence from Luther to Hitler, men who make the most absurd and elementary mistakes in regard to historic fact, mistakes concerning Bismarck and the Ems telegram, concerning the personality and reign of Wilhelm II, concerning the responsibility for the first World War (laid in this book exclusively on Germany's doorstep), concerning the reparation settlement at its conclusion.

Burke well said that he "knew no method of indicting an entire nation." Lord Vansittart has a method, a very simple one—to quote the worst of Luther and to compare it with the best of Cromwell, to sneer at what he cannot destroy, to denounce with heat but slight intelligence such reputable historians and political scientists as Professors Gooch and Carr, to magnify everything unpleasant, and more particularly to distort history by the omission of all facts that might prejudice his case.

The book which does this unfortunately has received a good deal of favorable, even if cursory, approval at the hands of American reviewers. To be sure, it is a lively volume; polemics generally are. But that is scarcely a reason for commendation. Even Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, who acknowledges the general absurdity of *Lessons of My Life* and who writes that the author has become the slave of an obsession, has a friendly word for him. "He possesses," we are told, "a kind of simple honesty which reacted strongly against the duplicity of diplomats." Dr. Niebuhr is a kind critic. I agree with him. The book may be credited with "simple honesty." In other respects it is a thoroughly unscientific, unhistorical, and reprehensible volume.

Princeton University

WALTER PHELPS HALL

THE LIBERAL MIND OF JOHN MORLEY. By *Warren Staebler*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, for the University of Cincinnati. 1943. Pp. 221. \$3.50.)

IN attempting to explain the ideas and temperament of Morley, Mr. Staebler has set himself a formidable task. The author of such a study needs the factual background for a biography and the discrimination and historical sense for a critical essay. He must also, in the case of Morley, be at home in the world of Victorian letters, political philosophy, and politics; he must follow ideas into the market place of practice, if only because Morley valued action above theory. These are exacting requirements.

Mr. Staebler does not fully satisfy them. He is familiar with the secondary material and with the wide range of Morley's writings; his chapter on "The Man of Letters" is the best of the book. But his critical judgment is too little developed, and he is not at home in the period. And this impairs the whole value of his work.

An underdeveloped critical sense leads to an overdeveloped respect for Morley's words. Page after page is a mosaic of unidentified quotations, at times so far out of context as to be meaningless. For example: "Unwilling to postpone 'the future to the present,' to purchase 'a small gratification now at the sacrifice of a greater and more enduring good to come,' Morley saw marriage much as Swift had seen it in his 'Letter to a Young Lady'" (pp. 16-17). Such vagueness conceals most of Morley's ideas in a haze of abstraction. There is too much of "the Liberalism that is the liberating 'fruit of education and thought'" (p. 126), "its substance the enlightened staunchness of individual thought and character" (p. 209), too little explanation of Morley's attitude toward the problems of the day. His liberal mind, after all, functioned in terms of those problems.

An inadequate understanding of the period leads to passages which lack historical roots. The discussion of Morley's Indian policy is an exception; it brings out clearly the basic factors involved. But the discussion of Ireland, although lucid in itself, takes little account of the explosive elements in that long crisis. It is also marred by omission and misstatement: Chamberlain's secession in 1886, so important for the future of Ireland and of liberalism, is not even suggested, and the defeat of the second Home Rule Bill is said to have caused the dissolution of the cabinet. The same faults appear elsewhere: Frederic Harrison is given sole credit for having ensured, by 1869, "the right of laborers to combine and form unions" (p. 62); the Parliament Bill is mentioned without a hint of its relation to Morley's old crusade for home rule; Morley is criticized for not "exposing" the cabinet after resigning from it in 1914, although such action at that time might have violated the rudiments of patriotism as well as of parliamentary ethics. These isolated examples, when taken together, indicate an unawareness of historical background.

There is no indication, furthermore, that liberalism was changing during this era. What was radical when Morley was a boy had become reactionary before he died. Did his mind change with the changing scene, or was it static by the time he entered politics? These pages do not give the answer, although it determined the relationship between his liberalism and his political action. Hence the study, unlike its subject, is remote from the realities of Morley's world.

University of Michigan

WILLIAM B. WILLCOX

ANCIENT GREECE IN MODERN AMERICA. By *John Robertson Macarthur*. (Caldwell: Caxton Printers. 1943. Pp. 396. \$6.00.)

THE professor of languages at the California Institute of Technology has written an interesting, but not very accurate, book about the ancient Greeks. It is addressed to the many moderns, especially in these United States, who have little acquaintance with the Greek language or literature and whose knowledge of both the past and the present is derived chiefly from the radio, the movies, the popular magazines, and the best-selling novels.

It would be very easy to criticize this book from a scholar's standpoint. It con-

tains a great many mistakes. For example, it speaks of the war between Athens and the Peloponnesian League as a "civil war" (p. 111). It says that Plato is famous for his "theory of ideas or ideals" (p. 177). It gives to the chief ancient historian of Alexander the Great the name "Arius" instead of Arrian (p. 187). It calls the Greek measure of distance a *stadé* (p. 202). There are far more important defects than these. The book has too many illustrations of ancient sculpture, too many examples of modern works of art with ancient subjects or executed more or less in the ancient manner, but it gives very few examples of the Greek literature, and not many of these are likely to arouse enthusiasm. Its account of the Greek gods is very defective. The author, though he avoids the common mistake of calling Dionysus the god of wine, gives no hint that to the Greeks this was the god who in the springtime causes the sap to flow again in trees and plants, causes the reproduction of animals, and thus perpetuates life upon the earth. He does not suggest that, because Demeter and Persephone personified the renewal of plant life after the winter, they were associated with life after death, nor does he explain how Cicero could say about the "mysteries" of these goddesses at Eleusis that from them "we learned not only how to live joyfully, but also how to die with a better hope." When this book tells the Greek stories, to which nearly 150 pages are devoted, no distinction is made between the legends and the free inventions of poets and dramatists within the framework of these legends.

In spite of all its faults, however, this book will be attractive and useful to many Americans. It gives the answers to many questions which puzzle those without much classical education. It shows how the culture of the ancient Greeks is woven into our own. It is a pity that it is not more accurate and more adequate. But it has a value for those for whom it was designed.

Princeton University

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE

Ancient and Medieval History

THE EXCAVATIONS AT DURA-EUROPOS, CONDUCTED BY YALE UNIVERSITY AND THE FRENCH ACADEMY OF INSCRIPTIONS AND LETTERS, FINAL REPORT IV. Edited by *M. I. Rostovtzeff, A. R. Bellinger, F. E. Brown, and C. B. Welles*. Part I, Fascicle I, THE GREEN GLAZED POTTERY. By *Nicholas Toll*, with Technological Notes by *Frederick R. Matson*. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1943. Pp. 95, xx. \$2.00.)

THE blue-green glazed pottery described in this volume has a peculiar interest, for it forms a link between the Hellenistic Greek world and the Mesopotamian. It has only recently received careful attention and the many problems connected with it are gradually being solved. This careful exposition, therefore, of abundant new material found on a scientifically excavated site is of prime importance. The vases were found both in the town of Doura, in which case they were mostly in

fragments, and in tombs, when they were sometimes complete and in good condition.

Dr. Toll has accomplished his difficult task with great ability. Careful descriptions of the material according to shapes form the main part of the text; the many technical problems and the chronology are discussed in an introduction, and the general findings are summed up in the concluding chapter.

The text is distinguished throughout by a grasp of the historical background, by scholarly caution, and an admirable conciseness. The chief conclusions are that the pottery found at Doura was made on the spot, not imported; that it lasted from the first century B.C. to the third century A.D.—a fact which enables us to observe an evolution of forms; and that it was an independent product, though based on Mesopotamian models. The best comparative material is given by the pottery from Seleucia on the Tigris, which has been competently discussed by N. C. Debevoise in his *Parthian Pottery from Seleucia on the Tigris* (University of Michigan Studies, 1934).

The technological notes on the pottery by F. R. Matson add further interest to the book. Among other problems the presence or absence of lead in the glaze is discussed. No definite opinion on this debated subject is advanced, for "too few analyses have been made to justify sweeping conclusions." However, as a result of spot tests which showed the presence of some lead in some of the fragments Mr. Matson advances the following theory:

The small amount of lead in some of the Dura glazes indicates that a soda-lime-lead-silica glaze was being developed by the potters. This differs in properties and composition from a true "lead glaze" such as was used on the Han pottery of China and on many of the Islamic wares in which lead was a major constituent of the glaze.

In other words, a small percentage of lead in a glaze does not change its essential character. The well-known potter Maude Robinson informs me that an alkaline glaze today, though generally composed without lead, may contain a modest proportion of lead, if the aim is to swing the blue of copper to a greener hue and give greater facility in application; and lead glazes with copper green are frequently modified to a bluish hue by the addition of soda or borax. The use of iron or chrome in the alkaline glaze will also turn the color to green.

Metropolitan Museum of Art

GISELA M. A. RICHTER

THE HORSE IN GREEK ART. By *Sidney David Markman*, Professor of Fine Arts and Archaeology, National University, Panama. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 35, edited by David M. Robinson.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1943. Pp. xvii, 211. Plates 60. \$5.00.)

HALLMARKS of Indo-Europeans when they entered Greece are the horse, battle-ax, and Indo-European speech. The horse thus played an important role in

Greek life from the beginning. In this study, unusual for a dissertation in its range and handling of material, Markman dates Greek monuments on the basis of the artist's rendering of the anatomy, proportions, and gait of the horse. This new method, not always infallible, has produced interesting and usually acceptable results.

To *The Horse in Greek Art* might have been added the sixteenth century B.C. gravestones above the Shaft Graves of the chieftains at Mycenae—the first crude attempts of the Greek in stonecarving. Further, the Greeks did not *ride* into Hellas (p. 5); horseback riding was unknown before the Geometric Age.

Chapter II attempts the difficult task of dating bronze horses on tripods and rectangular plaques and terracotta horses. No reliable criteria exist for dating the beginnings of the geometric style; one must work backward from 700 B.C., where fixed dates are available for late geometric art. The earliest plastic terracotta horse on a toilet box, dated previously at 800, can hardly be earlier than 750; it appears simultaneously with a painted vase depicting a man between two horses—a mark of orientalizing influence. Markman's geometric dates are too high. His bronze horse (Fig. 6), dated 875–25, is placed by the excavators at 750.

Protocorinthian pottery gives a firmer chronological basis for the orientalizing period. Cycladic vases offer unused evidence here. With their decorative motives of horses, lions, and heads of these animals, they point to an association with the Mistress of Animals and explain the artist's predilection for these designs. Athenian horsehead amphorae are probably connected with her. A goddess was associated with horses in Crete, the Cyclades, Sparta, and Boeotia; the horseheaded Demeter is doubtless a similar goddess.

One misses illustrations of the beautiful horses of Exekias in chapter IV, also called for by the discussion. The "colts" on coins of Rhegium might also have been used. Most pleasure is gained from the fine representations of horses on the Parthenon and Mausoleum, but nowhere is Markman's method more telling than in dating the horses of St. Mark's and the bronze race horse found in the sea.

Markman is to be congratulated on a stupendous task well achieved. Only those who have wrestled with problems presented in each chapter can appreciate the magnitude of this study, which will prove useful to many scholars and in its general chapters and illustrations to a wider public. If the artistic quality of the monuments is occasionally obscured by the technical language of equestrian anatomy, one must remember this is not an aesthetic treatise but a method for dating and undating Greek monuments.

Bryn Mawr College

MARY H. SWINDLER

STUDIES IN GREEK GENEALOGICAL CHRONOLOGY. By *Donald Wilson Præken*. (Lancaster: Lancaster Press. 1943. Pp. 113. \$2.00.)

THE purpose of these studies is to trace the development of the meaning and use of γενεά in the chronological calculations of the Greek historical writers. To

do this it is, of course, necessary to examine the term as it is used from the time of Homer to its first clear use as a chronological instrument and to observe its development in this function. The work is divided into four chapters, the first dealing with Homer, Hesiod, and the lyric poets, the second with Herodotus at some length, the third with Thucydides, and the last with Ephorus. The results are summed up in a very brief conclusion.

In defining his method the author states that his approach throughout is pragmatic. He has adhered faithfully to his plan, consistently using only firsthand material wherever it was available and, in the case of Ephorus, striving diligently to discover from all possible sources his method of reckoning.

In the first chapter of this work one finds the conclusion that the early poets do not use the term *γενεά* in any definite chronological sense, though they are well acquainted with the concept. It is the impression of this reader that the careful analysis of the meaning of Nestor's ruling among the third generation obscures the simple statement, which makes perfectly good sense if we read it in the light of our common and natural use of similar phrases.

When we come to Herodotus the situation is different. He clearly used the generation as a unit in chronological calculations, though apparently as a unit of varying value. The student of Herodotus and, indeed, everyone who is interested in the development of historiography will profit from the present investigation of Herodotus' treatment of the chronology of the period prior to that for which he had exact dates. Much light is thrown on the stories of Lydia, Persia, Assyria, and Egypt. The study of the last is particularly interesting and contains some attractive conjectures.

Thucydides, however, is not so rewarding. His concern was mainly with the present and the immediate past. It is not strange that no convincing case can be made for his having a definite theory of his own for dating occurrences in the remote past. Moreover, it is assuming a good deal to base argument or analysis on the hypothetical dates of composition of the work.

In spite of our fragmentary knowledge of Ephorus, his system of chronological reckoning can be discovered, along with the changes it causes in some of the traditional dates.

Through the body of the monograph, in dealing with material that could be made extremely difficult by bad presentation, the writer achieves a satisfactory clarity of expression. The same cannot be said of the introduction, the second sentence of which could scarcely be called lucid: "It is the purpose of the present study to observe the occurrence of the word in this sense, or any similar concept, in early Greek literature" (p. 1). One might also criticize the appearance of several startling misprints, such as "destruction" for "foundation" or "settlement" (p. 70).

In conclusion, it seems justifiable to ask whether the results of such a study,

which is certainly fascinating and challenging to the investigator, merit, even so, a publication that includes the many details of every step involved.

University of Cincinnati

ELIZABETH G. CASKEY

IOHANNIS BURIDANI: QUESTIONES SUPER LIBRIS QUATTUOR DE CAELO ET MUNDO. Edited by *Ernest Addison Moody*, Columbia University. [The Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication No. 40.] (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1942. Pp. xxxv, 274.)

THE most pressing problem facing the student of late medieval scientific thought is the dearth of modern texts. Dr. Moody is to be commended, therefore, for his determination to make a beginning. In choosing Jean Buridan's *Questions* on the *De caelo et mundo*, he has made a particularly happy selection, both as to author and work. Buridan's lucid treatment (composed, Moody suggests, about 1340) represents the sum of his ideas on local motion. Duhem and Michalski have already shown that Buridan's teaching was parroted and reworked by his many students at Paris and their successors throughout eastern Europe and Italy. In fact, there seems to be little doubt that the works of Buridan and his successors were read by and influenced the sixteenth and seventeenth century authors responsible for the definition of modern mechanics.

Although the necessities of war have forced the editor to base his text entirely on two manuscripts, it would appear both from external evidence and internal cogency and style that the collation of these two manuscripts has produced a text reasonably close to the original.

The major portion of the text is devoted to questions on the first two books. Questions on the first book deal primarily with the basic concepts of local motion treated largely from a kinematic standpoint. However, there is no attempt here to develop mathematical kinematic theorems like those of the contemporary Oxford schoolmen. Among those doctrines found in the first book are natural place, the three simple motions, the nature and motion of the heavens, the infinite relative to motion, and the measurement of potencies.

Questions on the second book are concerned broadly with motion of the heavens. Of particular interest are the eleventh, twelfth, and twenty-second questions. The eleventh concerns the uniformity and deformity of motion of the heavens; the twelfth supplies the "impetus" as an explanation for the acceleration of falling bodies; and the twenty-second discusses the possibility of diurnal rotation of the earth.

The most important question on the third and fourth books is that which outlines the "impetus" theory of projectile motion (Q. 2, Bk. III). The student should be cautioned, however, to turn to Buridan's *Questions* on the *Physics* (Q. 12, Bk. VIII) for a more detailed and lucid treatment of this theory. Appended to and concluding Dr. Moody's text is a brief and none too adequate subject index.

Washington, D. C.

MARSHALL CLAGETT

Modern European History

A HISTORY OF RUSSIA. By *George Vernadsky* and *Michael Karpovich*. Volume I, ANCIENT RUSSIA. By *George Vernadsky*, Research Associate in History in Yale University. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1943. Pp. xiv, 425. \$5.00.)

THIS new book on Russia, coming from the prolific pen of Professor Vernadsky, is to be, in accordance with a statement made in the preface, the first volume of a nine-volume work covering the whole history of Russia, five of which are to be written by Professor Vernadsky and the remaining four by Professor Karpovich. It is to be hoped that this ambitious scheme will materialize in not too distant a future. For, judging by the first volume of this series, the historical literature of the English-speaking world may be enriched by a much-needed definitive history of Russia.

As it stands now and judging by its own merit, this first volume, covering the history of ancient Russia from prehistoric beginnings to the establishment of the Kiev state, is a work of paramount importance. It is only in our own times that the purely arbitrary beginning of Russian history with the coming of the Norsemen in the ninth century has been gradually pushed back and the roots of Russia's past for more than a thousand years back have been uncovered. Important works have appeared on special phases of the problem of early Russian history, such as M. I. Rostovtzeff's *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* or the works of Gotie in Russian and others, but this is the first attempt to convey a systematic and clear picture of Russia's prehistoric development, with emphasis on those factors which contribute to the ulterior development of the Russian nation and the kindred nations living on the vast expanse of Russian Eurasia.

The enormous scope of the work and the amount of material, both archaeological and historical, awaiting such a pioneering work have forced upon the writer a gigantic labor of condensation which has somewhat affected his style but not his clarity of exposition and arrangement of material. By dividing his chapters into chronological periods corresponding to the domination of one particular race or tribe, the author has gained in clarity and has been able to give a well-rounded account of the life and history of the given period, covering as well various kindred tribes which tie into the picture. Similarly, the author extends the scope of his narrative geographically to cover border areas and cultures. As he presents a carefully sifted and comprehensively examined and documented study of the period, a complete picture of the prehistory of Russia is thus obtained. The insertion at the very beginning of each chapter of a discussion on the bibliography of the period covered has the drawback of breaking the continuity of the narrative, and some other method would have been preferable.

The relative scantiness of the material available, based mostly on philological

and archaeological data, invites some controversial theories which remain in the nature of speculations. The author endorses some of these, such as the so-called Danish theory of the origins of Riurik and the Varangians, who founded the first Russian state. It must, however, be said that though the author boldly takes sides in an unsettled controversy he does it by vindicating his view with carefully analyzed arguments.

University of California, Los Angeles

A. LOBANOV-ROSTOVSKY

NARYS ISTORII UKRAINY [OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF UKRAINE]. Edited by K. Guslisty, L. Slavyn, and F. Iastrebov. (Ufa: Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Institute for the History and Archaeology of Ukraine. 1942. Pp. 212.)

THE Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, which was founded in 1918 and whose seat was in Kiev until the German attack on the Soviet Union, was evacuated to Ufa, Bashkiria, in July, 1941. There the members of the academy, especially those of the department of sciences, have taken active part in local research work. Some of them, however, have proceeded with their Ukrainian studies, and the present *Outline of the History of Ukraine* is an evidence of that aspect in the work of the academy.

The book is not attractive from a typographical point of view, being poorly printed on poor paper, which is characteristic of the hard conditions of life in present-day Russia. That cultural work continues at all in such conditions is a proof of the indomitable spirit of the Soviet peoples and their thirst for knowledge. The book is addressed "to all who are interested in Ukraine and her culture, in the history of the Ukrainian people and their struggle for freedom and independence, for their Soviet state."

While the book is written in a popular style and contains no bibliography, it presents, on the whole and up to 1917, a sound and well-balanced outline not only of the political history of Ukraine but of her economic and cultural development as well. Beginning with 1917 the tone of the narrative changes, making the last chapters of the book similar to any official history of the Communist party. The approach of the authors is typical of the present-day mixture of the remnants of Marxism (such as quotations from Marx and Engels, apparently still inevitable in Soviet books) with the new Soviet patriotism.

Throughout the book the importance of the fraternal ties between the Ukrainian and the Russian peoples is emphasized. In respect to the Pereiaslav Union (1654), the comment is that "in the concrete historical conditions of that time the acceptance of the Tsar's protectorate was a lesser evil," since it prevented the absorption of Ukraine by either Poland or Turkey. This point of view is also reflected in the characteristics of the leading personages: Bogdan Khmelnytsky is a "progressive leader"; Mazeppa is a "traitor"; Peter the Great "a talented states-

man." A prominent position in the intellectual development of the nineteenth century is given to M. P. Dragomanov, "a historian, publicist, and social leader." Time marches on and Soviet opinion shifts, for in 1929 he was but a "leader of the liberal bourgeois nationalists" for the *Small Soviet Encyclopedia*. Dragomanov's advice to the Russians, the Poles, and the Ukrainians—"to strive for the common freedom instead of quarreling among themselves"—is quoted with obvious sympathy. To conclude with a critical remark: too little attention is given in the book to the political life of western (Austrian) Ukraine.

Yale University

GEORGE VERNADSKY

CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN EUROPEAN HISTORY. By S. Harrison Thomson.
(Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 390. \$3.75.)

THE volume under review, modestly called by its author a "slender effort," covers more than a thousand years. It is not a consecutive account of the peoples who inhabited the geographical entity known in our day as Czechoslovakia. Rather it is a presentation of certain aspects of their history which throw light upon some of the more acute problems of the republic which they founded in 1918. This avowed limited purpose of the book must be borne in mind in judging content and emphasis.

The author begins with a detailed account, somewhat close reading for one unacquainted with the period, of the relation of the Czech state to the Holy Roman Empire. He stresses, perhaps a bit too heavily, the point that whatever their reciprocal feudal relations the Czech state after the twelfth century retained complete control of its internal administration. By its own efforts it grew into a powerful independent kingdom. It was the tradition of freedom, the consciousness of a glorious past, that gave to the Czech people, after three hundred years of foreign domination, that fire and will which enabled them to regain their independence.

Quite other was the heritage of the Slovaks. A subject folk for nine centuries, engrossed in an unremitting struggle for subsistence, they had little opportunity to develop culturally or politically. Though their land bordered upon that of their kinsmen the Czechs, they had few dealings with them. It is the concern of the author to depict the circumstances that kept the two peoples apart except for an occasional temporary *rapprochement*. Particular attention is paid to the varying fortunes of the Czech language as a unifying force until the creation of written Slovak in the 1840's.

The factor of geographical separation, which helps to explain the inability of the Czechs and Slovaks to understand each other, did not exist in the case of the Germans and Czechs. Bohemia was their common home during and after the long process of German infiltration. Why these two peoples found themselves so alien to each other is a problem which has never been wholly solved, but much

may be learned from this vivid record of their long intercourse. The author seems to the reviewer to hold the scales steady, meting out justice with an even hand. The pages dealing with the Sudeten Germans are particularly illuminating.

It may be said that with the first two thirds of the book, ending with the year 1914, Professor Thomson accomplishes the task he set himself. It is a solid work, well worth the doing. The last third, covering the years 1914-38, would seem to have been an afterthought. These pages add nothing new to our knowledge of the period in question, but they tell their story so directly, so convincingly, that the reader is carried along in full sympathy. This is not to say that the author is pleading a cause. Though it is evident that his heart is with the Czechs he keeps in this chronicle of contemporary events to the habits of the careful historian.

The bibliography gives a well-selected list of titles, largely German and Czech, for each chapter or group of chapters. The format of the book leaves nothing to be desired.

Vassar College

LUCY E. TEXTOR

FROM LUTHER TO HITLER: THE HISTORY OF FASCIST-NAZI POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY. By *William Montgomery McGovern*. (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1941. Pp. xiv, 683. \$4.00.)

ALTHOUGH this work was published before Pearl Harbor, in some respects it is more timely now than when it first appeared. Mr. McGovern shows that Fascist-Nazi ideas were not developed overnight but were the product of a long intellectual history. Any plans for the surrender of Germany and the reconstruction of Europe must take full account of this fact, else the victory is likely to be lost in the peace.

The Fascist-Nazi ideology, according to Mr. McGovern, is a combination of two basic political doctrines: authoritarianism, the concentration of political power in the hands of the one or the few, and *étatisme*, the exaltation of the state over the individual. This philosophy has its roots in the Reformation. Luther, with his emphasis on the authority of the state, was a condition of its ultimate emergence. The doctrine of the divine right of kings was a precursor of the totalitarian creed. Hobbes, however, wrote the strongest brief for absolutism in the earlier period. During the ascendancy of Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, absolutism suffered a decline. It remained for the German philosophers of the eighteenth century to revive its lost prestige.

Kant, the father of modern idealism, was not a complete absolutist, but his disciple Fichte and still more Hegel were thoroughgoing exponents. Indeed, Hegel is the most potent intellectual source of totalitarianism. In addition to idealism, three schools of thought stem from his writings, leading up in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to the triumph of Fascism and National Socialism. There is

the traditionalist, as exemplified by Treitschke; the irrationalist, as exemplified by Bergson, Nietzsche, Sorel, and Pareto; the social Darwinists and their allies, the eugenicists and racialists, as exemplified by Bagehot, Galton, Gobineau, and H. S. Chamberlain. After thus tracing the genealogy of Fascism and National Socialism, Mr. McGovern brings his book to a close with an exposition of the totalitarian political philosophies.

From Luther to Hitler is not limited to a history of Fascist-Nazi doctrine. It is rather an account of political thought from the Reformation to the present, with emphasis on the German tradition. There are chapters here which deal with such topics as Grotius and international law and the rise of liberalism. Furthermore, each writer is treated as a whole; all his works and ideas are analyzed. As interesting as such treatment and such materials are, they nevertheless constitute a deviation from the main theme and break the continuity of the story.

Mr. McGovern's history is written from the point of view of a nineteenth century liberal of the utilitarian school. Democracy is simply rule by a majority. With this definition, the author makes Locke into a democrat, even though Locke's democracy was limited to one act of consultation (p. 85). Mr. McGovern's restricted view seems to be partly responsible for an occasional antidemocratic strain: Fascism is a tyranny of the majority over the minority (p. 582); dictatorship and democracy are almost compatible (p. 581); and Jackson's election to the presidency is a "triumph for the mob" (p. 581). Unless democracy means not only majority rule but one based on universal suffrage and the periodic expression of it, accompanied by representative institutions, party government, and the protection of minority rights, it is easily married to dictatorship. If it is treated on a purely mechanical or institutional basis, separated from its underlying ideas, the dignity of the individual, freedom and equality, it is easily compromised.

There is more than one judgment on the writers discussed with which the reviewer cannot agree. Surely Plato and Aristotle are not aptly described as closet philosophers. Nor did Carlyle exert a profound influence; nor can it be said that his characteristic system of rule was the hero king. Locke stood not only for an individualist conception of property rights but for a social one as well, which is overlooked by historian after historian. There are omissions, too, of writers who have taken part in the *étatist* tradition, such as socialist writers; and of those who have taken part in the authoritarian tradition, such as Ruskin, Stephen, and Maine in England. Nor is there any account taken of American eugenicists, nor Fascist writers such as Lawrence Dennis.

From Luther to Hitler is a scholarly work, useful as a reference for the ordinary reader and as a history for the more advanced. The chapters on the German writers are especially valuable. Yet it is a bloodless history. There is no real attempt to show the relation of ideas to the world in which men live and move. To relate ideas in a time sequence and not to indicate the kind of life to which they give rise is to indulge in intellectualism. The growth of Fascist-Nazi ideas is a

dramatic as well as a tragic history; yet neither of these characteristics emerges from the pages of this book.

University of Minnesota

BENJAMIN E. LIPPINCOTT

THE TWO MARSHALS—BAZAINE, PÉTAINE. By *Philip Guedalla*. (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 1943. Pp. xii, 346. \$3.00.)

The Two Marshals is really two books held together by the coincidence that Bazaine and Pétain were both marshals of France and the probability that a book about the latter would be popular. The life of Bazaine is a useful contribution to the bibliography of French history.

Since Bazaine was a career soldier, an officer in the Foreign Legion, an adventurer in the Spanish Civil War (1835-38), and a general officer who won the marshal's baton from Napoleon III, his story is a colorful picture of the French military way of life in the middle quarters of the last century. Guedalla convincingly explains that Bazaine's experiences in Africa and Spain were the prepondering influences in his military education. They admirably fitted him for the Mexican expedition, where he was a great success, and, at the same time, completely unfitted him for the warfare with which the Prussians confronted him in 1870. Guedalla generalizes Bazaine's experience to explain that the North African military problems conditioned all French military thinking, so that the French army was unable to appreciate the realities of war on the continent of Europe.

Most readers will be interested to see that Guedalla reverses the decision of the tribunal that condemned Bazaine to death. The circumstances surrounding both Bazaine's assumption of command in 1870 and his surrender at Metz should exonerate this much-maligned soldier. France needed a scapegoat to excuse herself from the disaster of 1870, and Bazaine was the victim rather than a traitor. Bazaine's Mexican career, too, is most interestingly presented. In this day, when the problems of occupying and pacifying conquered territory are stark realities, Bazaine's record takes on a new light.

The section on Pétain is so obviously colored by the debacle of 1940 and the subsequent misery of France that only time and further research can allow a sound judgment. It is improbable, however, that future historians will explain Pétain's whole life in the light of the surrender of 1940, and it will be some time before we can make a reasoned judgment on the French moral crisis of 1932-39.

Every reviewer of a book by Philip Guedalla must carry the author's epigrams on his own conscience. Some of them are brilliant, some are clever, some are flat, but in all of them one gets the distinct impression that either a hard historical fact or a reasonably well-established interpretation must look out for itself if it gets in the way of a Guedalla epigram.

The reviewer does not want to be hypercritical, but he must warn students of

French military history that here is a book in which neither Jomini nor Clausewitz appears in the index.

University of Minnesota

JOHN B. WOLF

GREECE AGAINST THE AXIS. By Stanley Casson. (Washington: American Council on Public Affairs. 1943. Pp. 150. Cloth \$2.50, paper \$2.00.)

SHORTLY before the war a German "tourist" wrote a book, *Unsterbliches Hellas*, another example of revolting German cynicism as well as a classic prophecy. Although we now hardly need to be told, Casson's book shows why and how inevitable and undying is this prophecy. Naturally, there have already been quite a few accounts of the epic resistance of the Greeks to Italy's and Germany's cowardly aggression and occupation. There cannot be too many and all should be required reading for German and Italian schoolchildren as long as the memory of Germany's crime against the spirit and flesh of ancient and modern Greece remains.

Greece against the Axis does not pretend to be history except in the sense of personal history and observation of a military expert who is at home in both classical and modern Greece, has taught Greek history at Oxford for twenty years, and is the author of several significant works on ancient Greece. This is the fifth time that he has observed present-day Greece at war. Thus the smoke of the latest Italian and German campaigns mingles in his book with the dust of Xerxes' and Caesar's ancient battles.

It would be a poor writer indeed who could succeed in making the story of *Greece against the Axis* anything but dramatic. Casson is a brilliant Englishman who has found a fitting subject for his talent. Some historians, however, will question a few of his statements and sweeping generalizations. Greek classics were being published at Moschopolis long before the Greek War of Independence; England of the early nineteenth, rather than of the eighteenth, century got excited about Ali of Tepelen. For Casson all Greeks are noble and intelligent, but wherever there are traces of "Bulgar blood" the inhabitants are "surly and barbaric"; "Bulgars and Rumanians had to have freedom forced on them"; all Italians and Germans are stupid. There are also several typographical errors in this edition of a book which was first published in England in 1941.

The time has not yet come to write the history of the Albanian and Greek campaigns, and many more books will be written before the full story is available. *Greece against the Axis* will be a valuable contribution by one who held an important vantage point almost from the start, as the first member of the British military mission to arrive in Greece, in November, 1940, and later as a member of the British general staff. Lieutenant Colonel Casson knows how to evaluate as well as describe his experiences.

Washington, D. C.

JAMES F. CLARKE

WIND OF FREEDOM: THE HISTORY OF THE INVASION OF GREECE BY THE AXIS POWERS, 1940-1941. By *Compton Mackenzie*. (London: Chatto and Windus. 1943. Pp. 276.)

THE author knows Greece, for he was during the last war successively military control officer in Athens and director of the Aegean Intelligence Service, after serving as captain at Gallipoli, thus gaining the experiences described in his books *Gallipoli*, *Athenian*, *Greek*, and *Aegean Memories*. But he was not in Greece during the period now under review, and this latest work is accordingly a compilation from Greek and British official publications, the books of eyewitnesses, such as Miss Hollingworth, the American war correspondent Stowe, Casson, Wisdom, Walker, Archer, and Hole, as well as newspaper articles.

The first chapter describes prewar Greco-Italian relations, especially since the Italian occupation of the Dodecanese in 1912, which, with the bombardment of Corfu in 1923, embittered them, particularly since Mussolini regarded himself as the heir of Venice and Genoa in the Levant. The author thinks, however, that "if the British navy had possessed a lease at Argostoli," which Cephalonian port Venizelos proposed to Lloyd George to exchange for Cyprus in 1912—"it is doubtful whether Mussolini would have risked this attack on Greece." But, on the other hand, he writes that "from the very beginning of Fascism Greece was regarded as an obstacle in the way of his [Mussolini's] ambitious plans." The Greeks had no desire for war against Italy, as Vlachos wrote in his open letter to Hitler, even after the sinking of the *Héle* off Tenos on the Feast of the Assumption. This book omits the facts that Tenos was the last Venetian colony and that the Catholic archbishop of Athens was a Tenicote of Italian origin. "Hellas was silent" about the authors of this torpedo outrage.

"The attack on Greece had been planned as far back as April, 1939," but the actual date, October 28, was chosen because it was "the anniversary of the Fascist March on Rome." Most of the book, the title of which is the Erzones' battlecry, is devoted to the heroism of the Greek soldiers, whose defeat of the Julia Alpini is compared with Marathon, while the Rome radio euphemistically called it a "Pyrrhic victory." Throughout "the simple Greek soldier saved Greece," and "the action in the Pindus will count as one of the decisive battles of the world," while Rupel in 1941 redeemed the disgrace of its surrender in 1916. The book is very fair to Metaxás, a great strategist but not a great statesman, no lover of Britain, which had offended him in the previous war, yet, despite his German training, which made him *der kleine Molke*, sufficiently realist to recognize that Greece, as a Mediterranean state, must be a friend of Britain.

Tsolakoglov, the Greek Quisling, is shown to have made the armistice on his own initiative against Tsouderos' orders. The reviewer, who was the whole time in Athens, can corroborate the enormous difference between the Italian and the German methods of warfare, beginning with the explosion at the Piraeus, which broke the windows of the Catholic cathedral six miles away. Morosini's bombard-

ment of the Parthenon was not repeated, but his Hanoverian gunner, who fired the shot, had descendants. The pluck of the king, whom "the Germans regarded as their chief enemy," during the Cretan retreat is justly extolled, and the heroism of the Cretans, including the women, occasions an accurate summary of "the great Greek island's" stormy history, from which, however, "the Great Rebellion" of 1866-69 is omitted. Greece's heroic resistance delayed Hitler's Russian campaign, Crete perhaps saved Cyprus, and there was a great "moral impression made upon American opinion."

The appendix shows "The New Greek Forces at War" outside Greece, comprising men from twenty to thirty-six, a special corps formed in the United States, the "Sacred Band" in Palestine, the navy, and mercantile marine. Such is what the author modestly calls a provisional attempt to present an outline of the story.

Durban, South Africa

WILLIAM MILLER

VICTORS IN CHAINS: GREEK RESISTANCE, 1942-3. By *Amyntor*. (London: Hutchinson and Company. 1943. Pp. 80. 3s.6d.)

THIS little book, published by authority of the Greek Ministry of Information and probably written by the minister, Mr. Michalopoulos, who graduated at Oriel College, Oxford, and writes English perfectly, contains the history of enslaved Greece, as far as it is possible, and forms, therefore, a sequel to Mr. Compton Mackenzie's work. Its text is: "Greece is an occupied country but its people are undefeated." It describes the guerrilla warfare, especially in Crete and the mountains of the mainland, train wrecking at Drama and Larissa, fires, and sabotage, despite the discouragement of the archbishop, who was deposed for cursing the German military commander for shooting hostages.

Italian casualties have been 1,200 monthly, but the Germans, who admitted that "they have never come across such stubborn opposition as in Greece," are more drastic in reprisals than the Italians. A "Greek summed up the attitude of the ordinary civilians in these words: 'towards Germans intense hatred, towards Italians intense contempt.'" Worst of all are the Bulgarians in Thrace and Macedonia, who, wishing to retain those provinces after the war, have executed priests who refused to conduct the services in Bulgarian, closed Salonika University, and dismissed all schoolmasters who would not teach in that language. The Italians made Italian the second language taught in schools and issued official history books, compiled on fascist lines.

Athens University has been closed indefinitely, but the students, always active in political movements, have continued demonstrations, despite the admonitions of the Greek Quisling, who also in vain asked the people "not to listen to Allied broadcasts." Public meetings were held in shelters during air raids; "*Aera*," the wacry of the *Evzones*, was chalked up on walls. "The Greeks will not work for the Germans even if faced with famine." Wide areas lie fallow and the food

shortage has been further increased by the arrival of refugees from Bulgaria's "Aegean colony," whence seventy thousand were expelled. Especially heroic is the historic attitude of the women, who produced a Greek Joan of Arc in the War of Independence. As always, the church has been a "centre of resistance," while six clandestine newspapers are published, a facsimile of one of which, *Μαχομένη Ελλάς*, "Fighting Greece," forms one of the fifteen illustrations of this book.

The surviving eighteen public journals are obliged to write what the Axis leaders wish, but "the spirit of Aristophanes seems to inspire the journalists." All radio sets outside Athens have been confiscated, and listeners to London and Cairo broadcasts shot. But a well-known Dodecanesian speaks to them from Cairo. Still greater risks are taken by Greeks giving secret hospitality to British soldiers left behind after the evacuation and assisting them to find boats in which to escape, as many have escaped, especially from Chios. We are told that some Axis officials "have their price." The conclusion of this interesting study is that "the Greek people have no doubt about ultimate victory for the cause which has been their own through so many centuries."

Durban, South Africa

WILLIAM MILLER

THE FIGHT OF THE NORWEGIAN CHURCH AGAINST NAZISM. By *Bjarne Høye* and *Trygve M. Ager*. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1943. Pp. 180. \$1.75.)

THEY CAME AS FRIENDS. By *Tor Myklebost*. Translated by *Trygve M. Ager*. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 1943. Pp. xii, 297. \$2.50.)

THE present struggle in Norway has produced quite a shelfful of books, each of which throws light on some phase of the Norwegian opposition to Nazism. The political maturity of the people and the fundamental unity, which for the time being has pushed all lesser differences into the background, have enabled the Norwegians to maintain opposition to Nazification with a clearheaded consistency that has been unsurpassed. The church was the first to organize a home front and has throughout the past three years taken the lead in Norway's fight.

The Fight of the Norwegian Church against Nazism relates the story of this struggle step by step. The church rose from strength to strength in face of persecution. To quote Bishop Einar Berggrav, the primate of the church, "When the truth becomes something sacred for us it is then that it can create martyrs" (p. 29). The translation is far from happy. The church people and also the small dissenting religious groups responded with magnificent loyalty as terrorism welded the people firmly together and taught them to value their institutions. But it is not only the courage of martyrs that has given Berggrav and the other church leaders their influence. Every step taken has been justified by proclamation

or letter. So the struggle has produced a series of documents that in restraint, intellectual acumen, and learning might well be classed with the politico-religious documents of seventeenth century England.

In defining the relation between the Evangelical Lutheran church and the state, it was emphasized that, while the constitution laid upon the government certain rights and duties in connection with the church, these were limited, and in its essential functions the church was not under the state. The church was a folk church rather than a state church, and even the church property belonged to the people in the church, not to the state. The church was neither the master of the state nor its servant, but, as "the conscience of the state" (p. 128), it was its duty to protest against abuses and crimes even when not directed against the church itself, as for example the persecution of the Jews. The church was consistently "loyal to the occupying power within the limits set down by international law" (p. 133) but resisted encroachments upon its rights. The clergy, for example, insisted upon their duty to receive confessions under the pledge of silence. This, they declared, was the Magna Carta of conscience. And when the government interfered with divine worship, the logical next step was to sever all connections with that government and set up a free church in which the pastors could continue all their functions except those imposed by that state. A temporary church leadership has been set up, but no pronouncement for the future has been uttered.

The authors, both of whom are connected with the information service of the Norwegian government, have done most valuable service in making these documents available in full or through lengthy citations.

They Came as Friends is quite a different book. It is one of the many splendid books by journalists which this crisis has called forth. It is well written—and well translated—dramatic, vivid, and withal authoritative. There is, moreover, a white heat about it that could come only from one who is himself a part of the suffering people. "We Came as Friends" was the slogan of the Germans. The author describes the bewilderment that was rampant in southern Norway during the first months of occupation, when no news of the grim fighting in the north reached the south. Then the broadcasts from London came through, soldiers returned from the war, and more and more people were catching glimpses of the "Face behind the Mask" of their "protectors." Even then some optimism remained as the people watched the clumsy maneuvers of seasick sailors, shouting "*Wir fahren nach England*" as they were training to cross the North Sea. Such invasion had to fail and might bring a speedy end to the war. Besides, the Norwegians were slow about giving up their faith in negotiations. "The trouble with the Norwegian people is that it has been debrutalized!" (p. 26) fumed Quisling in a shrill falsetto, and even he may utter a grain of truth.

On September 25, 1940, the mask was completely thrown aside, and Nazism was locked in an unrelenting struggle with the home front. It is a story of un-

believable brutality, and the writer spares us no detail. Much of what he relates is testimony given in Sweden by refugees. This testimony was given and recorded under strict legal guarantees, and, moreover, "the marks on their bodies provided proof of the truth of their accounts" (p. 226). But the struggle hardened the people and stiffened resistance. So every act of terrorism was met with a never-failing resourcefulness and courage which has been upheld by the faith that a new day will dawn.

Saint Olaf College

KAREN LARSEN

Far Eastern History

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE. By *L. Carrington Goodrich*, Associate Professor of Chinese, Columbia University. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1943. Pp. xv, 260. \$2.50.)

THIS volume is of worth out of all proportion to its inadequacy of size and format. One senses the relation of publisher to author as having been similar to that of the serpent to Eve—except that here the publisher whispered counsel against the author's plucking too much from the tree of knowledge lest his work become too weighty and expensive for popular consumption. Someday when books of knowledge, beauty, and inspiration are not limited by paper shortage and government orders (while scandal sheets and comics wax fatter than ever), it is to be hoped that Professor Goodrich may be moved—and permitted—to bring out in more attractive form the present study and, more important, to prepare an exhaustive exposition of Chinese history and culture such as the present introduction proves him so admirably qualified to do.

Horrifying to those who consider that for Western students the history of China prior to the signing of the Treaty of Nanking is quite unimportant (but gratifying to those who believe that the Chinese really lived a civilized life before entering upon relatively intimate relations with the Western world), Professor Goodrich devotes 209 of his less than 232 pages of text to the pre-Manchu period. Each of the nine chapters of the work is excellent, but the first seven, which narrate the development of the Chinese people (rather than that of their rulers) from Peking Man through the Ming period, are the best. These are packed to overflowing with bits, or chunks, of valuable and interesting information, gathered quite literally from a thousand sources, not hitherto, for the most part, woven even loosely into a historical tapestry. The amplitude, without superfluity, of the materials used at times renders the book difficult to read. Most paragraphs have a dozen or more important thoughts and facts instead of one, as many grammarians and stylists hold desirable.

Like mail-order catalogues and city directories, rich in materials but disjointed

in style, this work must be reread many times with concentration if not with prayer before its content can be mastered. But whether this be done or not it is comforting to know that reference to the sixteen-page index will set one on the trail of more materials interestingly set forth than are to be found in any other account of China (known to this reviewer) of several times its size. Eight pages of supplementary readings, a chronological table, a chronological chart, twenty-four unhackneyed illustrations, and seventeen clear and uncrowded outline maps add greatly to the value of the work.

University of Chicago

HARLEY FARNSWORTH MACNAIR

NUSANTARA: A HISTORY OF THE EAST INDIAN ARCHIPELAGO.

By *Bernard H. M. Vlekke*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xv, 439. \$5.00.)

Forty years ago Clive Day's *The Dutch in Java* was published in this country. It was acclaimed by the Dutch as an excellent history of their rule in the East Indies. Now there is published in this country another history of the Netherlands Indies, written not by an American but by a Dutch scholar in exile. This new history will take an honored place beside the earlier study by Day. In the preparation of this study Dr. Vlekke worked under a considerable handicap. The rich materials in Dutch libraries were not available to him. The amount of material on Dutch colonial history in American libraries is surprisingly large, but it is composed chiefly of secondary sources. Within the framework of this limitation Dr. Vlekke has produced an excellent piece of work. It is a synopsis of historical studies rather than a history based upon primary sources.

The earlier chapters are better than the later ones. This may in part be accounted for by the author's special interest in that period of history. The first four chapters—"The Dawn of History," "The Medieval Period of Indonesian History," "Gajah Mada, Founder of the Javanese Empire," and "Mohammedans and Portuguese"—are very well done and constitute a real contribution to the literature of the subject in the English language. The treatment of the period before the restoration of Dutch rule in 1816 receives a disproportionate amount of space, in the opinion of the reviewer. This is not a serious defect, however, as there are several books in English dealing with the period since 1816 in greater or less detail. Dr. Vlekke limited the scope of his work rather rigidly to the history of the East Indies. As a result much illuminating background material from the history of the metropolitan country is excluded. The last part of the book might have been better organized. More chapters, each devoted to the development of a movement or the treatment of an episode, would have improved the study. As it is the chapters cover much more or less related material. Dr. Vlekke is not an expert on colonial policy and administration. The reader will not find in this book a critical analysis of Dutch policy in this vast Eastern dependency, whose

rapid rise to a position of importance in world politics and economy has amazed people everywhere.

The title selected for the book will strike even most Indies Netherlanders as odd. *Nusantara* is the Malay term for "Empire of the Islands." Dr. Vlekke chose it as a tribute to Dewantoro, the Javanese leader of an Indonesian cultural movement, who first used this term as applied to the Indies archipelago. The term is known to few and it is very improbable that it will ever acquire much usage. After several decades of groping for a name more suitable than the official one for a country with a rapidly rising national consciousness, the nationalist movement adopted the name Indonesia. This name has now been generally accepted. While it has not yet been officially adopted by the government, it has been officially recognized and used.

These criticisms are not meant to detract from the general excellence of this study. They merely suggest that this is not a perfect or definitive work. *Nusantara* has an assured place in the literature on the history of Western imperialism in the Far East and the beginnings of the rise of a new nation.

The book contains a valuable chronological epitome, but no bibliography, unfortunately.

University of Kentucky

AMRY VANDENBOSCH

American History

HISTORY OF BIGOTRY IN THE UNITED STATES. By *Gustavus Myers*. (New York: Random House. 1943. Pp. viii, 504. \$3.50.)

THIS book admirably illustrates the dangers confronting amateurs who attempt to sail the historical seas without using the navigation charts so painstakingly prepared by professionals. In 1925 Gustavus Myers, his liberal sensitivities stung by the rise of the Klan, determined to expose American bigotry as he had the evils of great fortunes and Tammany Hall. Apparently unaware that others had interested themselves in this problem, he set out to master the source materials from colonial days to the present, ignoring the vast store of monographic materials on his subject. The result, published a few months after his death, adds little to our knowledge of the subject and is bad history to boot.

The first two thirds of the book, in which Mr. Myers traces the history of intolerance from the early colonial settlements to the presidential campaign of 1928, demonstrates the futility of his efforts. He writes of witchcraft without referring to Notestein, Upham, Kittredge, or the host of others who have shed light on that subject; of eighteenth century anti-Catholicism with no mention of Sister Mary Augustina's excellent study; of Antimasonry without citing McCarthy's standard account; of pre-Civil War Nativism without knowledge of my

own work on that subject; of Know-Nothingism with no regard for the many existing studies; of the A.P.A. without utilizing Stauffer's unpublished study in the Harvard Library; of the modern Klan with no mention of Mecklin's fine volume; of the election of 1928 without using Michael Williams' interesting findings.

The result of this light scratching over well-plowed ground is naturally disappointing. Not only does Mr. Myers fail to tell the story with the detail and understanding of the monographic writers, but his history is episodic and neglects the underlying forces responsible for the recurrent waves of intolerance. One searches in vain for mention of such elementary causal forces as the colonial wars, the liberalizing currents of the Revolution, immigration, sectionalism, or foreign influences. No historian can read these pages without regretting that the author did not use his admitted talents to master the literature of the subject, fill in the gaps, and mold the whole into an interpretative account of American bigotry. History, after all, is a co-operative subject.

The final third of the book deals largely with anti-Semitism from the time that Henry Ford voiced his calumnies in the *Dearborn Independent* to Lindbergh's Des Moines speech in 1941. Here all pretense of objectivity vanishes, and Mr. Myers writes with the same crusading zeal that makes his *Great American Fortunes* so readable today, refuting the charges made against the Jews, flailing their spokesmen, and showing the recurrence of hoary anti-Catholic arguments in this new role. But despite the author's sincerity he adds little to our knowledge, for he bases his account on well-known congressional reports and newspapers and offers none of the intimate details that make Carlson's *Under Cover* such fascinating reading.

As might be expected in a book of this kind errors in perspective and judgment are many, though factual errors are few. Footnotes allow the reader to follow the author's trail through such sources as he used, but the index is brief and there is no bibliography. It is to be hoped that Mr. Myers' labors will be useful in combating the bigotry which he describes, but the history of intolerance in America has yet to be written.

Smith College

RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON

AMERICAN POLITICAL PARTIES: THEIR NATURAL HISTORY. By Wilfred E. Binkley, Professor of History and Political Science, Ohio Northern University. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1943. Pp. xi, 407, xii. \$3.75.)

PROFESSOR Binkley has made a real contribution to our better understanding of the American party system. With skill and discrimination he marshals in fresh array the facts that students need if they are to appreciate the task faced by party leaders. No other history of American parties has achieved the synthesis and clarity of this volume. It amply demonstrates the value of studying the past in

order to understand the present and intelligently face the future. Professor Binkley has an explicit theory of party government, and consequently his book is constructed upon a conceptual framework that makes the factual data meaningful and apposite. The publisher, however, does his author a disservice by advertising his work as "original" and "revolutionary." It is rather a well-ordered handling of largely secondary source materials.

The book is more an interpretative analysis than a "natural history." Nevertheless, the subtitle is justified inasmuch as the author discusses the nature of our party system as revealed by partisan activity chronologically viewed. He sees our party system as a means for reconciling group differences and aligning sectional and economic interests into combinations capable of achieving majority support. This interpretation is applied particularly to presidential elections. The contenders to be successful must be specialists in "group diplomacy." By this standard our great Presidents have been Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, McKinley, Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt. The function of the American statesman is seen as a "search for the integrating ideas that make party combinations tolerable." Thus, Lincoln is described as "searching with superb intelligence to discover the point of equilibrium among the conflicting social forces of the nation and tolerant of all sorts and conditions of men" (p. 310). Are not our great Presidents much more than manipulators of diverse political groups? Can they be both spokesmen of the people and group diplomats? Is the "natural history" of parties merely a story of maneuvering and trading? Professor Binkley would doubtless agree that it is more than this, but he might well have developed further the role of positive presidential leadership. "After all," he states (p. 376), "it is the politician-statesman's function to ascertain, express and translate into public policies the current balance of social forces. In the light of electoral verdicts, what political leader has been more successful in performing that particular function than the second President Roosevelt?" While one is inclined perforce to agree with this view in some measure, the uneasy feeling remains that we have need for a higher vision of the public welfare and that this has been given us by our greatest Presidents. On the other hand, we often overlook the tenuous character of presidential power. There is no firm political structure for implementing party policy or presidential direction.

Professor Binkley points (1) to the dangerous political practice of merely "playing the breaks" and concludes (2) that the successful party of the future must deliberately outbid its rival for the votes of the middle and lower income groups. Is there a fundamental distinction between these two conclusions? Will the balancing of sectional demands and the search for an adjustment of factional forces remain the task of American politics through the decades ahead as has been the case in the past, or does the increased burden placed upon the central government call for a more positive assertion of national purpose together with appropriate institutional adjustments? Such profoundly difficult questions are left un-

Brigance: A History and Criticism of American Public Address 485

answered in the mind of this reviewer after finishing Professor Binkley's very interesting volume.

Harvard University

PENDLETON HERRING

A HISTORY AND CRITICISM OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS.

Prepared under the auspices of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. Edited by *William Norwood Brigance*. [McGraw-Hill Series in Speech.] (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1943. Pp. xvii, 500, xxxviii; vii, 501-1030. Two volumes, \$10.00.)

For many years college teachers of public speaking have been developing the research aspects of their field, among which historical studies have taken a considerable place. We now have available a general synthesis of the many masters' essays and doctoral dissertations, together with a good deal of new research occasioned by the project itself. The National Association of Teachers of Speech, under whose auspices the work appears, has apparently spared no effort to produce a carefully planned and scholarly historical account and critical evaluation. The bibliographies, for example, are models of scholarship.

The first part of the study is devoted to the historical development of the American public address. This section includes essays on the colonial period, the early national period, the later national period, woman's introduction to the American platform, and the teaching of rhetoric during the classical period of American education. This part of the book, which makes up 213 of the close to a thousand pages of the whole, is the most useful part of the two volumes for historians. Here one finds a sustained effort, on the whole fairly successful, to discuss the public address in terms of our total history. At the price of reading much that is very familiar one does see the story of public speaking in relationship to such social forces as the constantly increasing body of printed material, competing new types of social diversion, the decline of the pulpit as a national force, and the overshadowing of the town meeting by new governmental institutions. It is unfortunate that no discussion is given to the impact of the radio on the public address. Indian oratory is barely mentioned, and almost nothing is said of the influence on public speech of our polyglot ethnic origins and background.

The greater part of the two volumes is composed of twenty-eight pieces, written by different essayists, on particular public speakers in the fields of religion, education, labor, and statecraft. The omission of business addresses at commercial conventions is unfortunate. Many will feel that an evangelist of a later vintage than Jonathan Edwards might well have been chosen. On the whole, however, the selection of individuals can easily be defended as representative and sensible. No one pattern of treatment was imposed by the editor on the essayists. In general attention has been given to the methods used in the preparation of the public address, the arrangement of the material, the methods of persuasion (deductive,

inductive arguments, pathetic and ethical proofs, figures, allusions, and so on), and to the physique, voice, personality, and influence of the speaker. Much of the material will be familiar to most historians, though sometimes considerable digging in primary sources has yielded fresh details. This is especially true in the essays which emphasize the situation or occasion and the audience. Some of the essays, such as those on Webster and Lincoln, are excellent; others are less outstanding. Several of the contributors try to deal with the difficult problem of evaluating the influence of the public speaking of their subject. By and large these efforts result in the mere restating of common knowledge in very general terms (pp. 404, 576, 749, for example).

In regard to the larger issues on which there is little explicit discussion in this volume, one might cite these: did the frontier produce a distinctive type of public speaking? did the Old South? in just what respects has American oratory differed most notably from British? Perhaps the failure of the volume to throw much light on these and other questions is the result of the failure to integrate the general historical sections which open the book with the subsequent personalized case histories.

Whatever the limitations of this ambitious undertaking, its merits are genuine. Students of the men and women whose public speaking has been analyzed, of American education, and of American public opinion should take especial care not to overlook it.

University of Wisconsin

MERLE CURTI

THE WAKE OF THE PRAIRIE SCHOONER. By *Irene D. Paden*. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1943. Pp. xix, 514. \$3.00.)

WHEN the late A. B. Hulbert found the original township maps showing the overland trails as marked by the surveyors, when he clothed these maps in the many incidents of travel culled from contemporary diaries of the California gold rush, and when he published this material under the title of *Forty-niners*, many students of the overland emigration believed that the California Trail had been accurately and finally recorded. A revision of that viewpoint is now necessary because of the appearance of *The Wake of the Prairie Schooner*.

The ingenious Padens have long had an interest in the geography of Western trails. With Mrs. Paden as secretary and recorder of field notes, they, with a son and others from time to time, turned to the California and Oregon trails and along them spent nine summers. With the help of local historians old ruts and landmarks not known to exist were brought to light. It can be said without much exaggeration that the Padens could give proof of visual evidence of the old trails for nearly every foot of the way to the Pacific.

Having consulted the published and many unpublished emigrant diaries for information necessary to determine the routes and crossings, Mrs. Paden became

the possessor of a mass of information not only about the geography of the trails but also about the incidents of early travel. This information, along with the record of the Padens' trips, told in thirty chapters, takes one over the trails from Missouri to Oregon and California in the years of the great emigration. The California and Oregon emigrants, along with the Padens, go out the North Platte route to Fort Hall, then proceed up the Oregon Trail before they take the route to California. Only two major cut-offs, Hasting's and Lassen's, are omitted. With side lights on Mormons, Indians, Marcus Whitman, and other topics, this "diary" ranks high in readability and probably stands as the final mapping of the old trails. A preface by Professor H. E. Bolton, pen-and-ink sketches by the author, and eleven sectional maps are not the least of the interesting aspects of this remarkable book.

While Mrs. Paden, with her broad sympathy for the emigrants and a keen sense of humor, has pierced many overstatements made by the Argonauts, she records some open to question. According to the forty-niners, trout were first caught west of South Pass, and the author concludes that this species was found "only west of the Continental Divide." Even if emigrants did not report catching trout in the upper Platte, were they not there? Lewis and Clark had found them in the upper Missouri long before. The Mormon handcart emigration of 1856 was not made up of 1,200 Saints but of more than 1,600. This use of handcarts was not the consequence of faulty planning but was a deliberate experiment. The disaster that came to the emigration visited only the fourth and fifth companies, of which over two hundred died.

Although lacking a map of the complete trails or a page reference to the sectional maps, failing often to identify the emigrant quoted, and omitting from the index the oft-used word "cholera," this volume stands as the best handbook on the overland routes that either the historical student or the motorist can use.

River Falls, Wisconsin

WALKER D. WYMAN

THE SPIRIT OF AMERICAN ECONOMICS: A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC IDEAS IN THE UNITED STATES PRIOR TO THE GREAT DEPRESSION. By J. F. Normano. With a Supplement, THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANADIAN ECONOMIC IDEAS, by A. R. M. Lower. (New York: Committee on the Study of Economic Thought; distributed by John Day Company. 1943. Pp. 252. \$3.50.)

THE chief author of this book explains that ever since his arrival in this country in 1930 he had desired to examine the evolution of economic thought in the United States but that he met with "outspoken discouragement" from his colleagues, most of whom "denied the very existence of any genuine American economic thought." It is to be hoped for the sake of the reputation of some learned institution that this is not a quite accurate statement. Rightly disregarding this

advice, the author began to explore the field and came to the conviction that the oft-cited adverse opinion of Professor Dunbar of Harvard is "amazing."

The author exemplifies both some of the advantages and some of the disadvantages which a foreign observer enjoys, or under which he suffers, as compared with more conservative natives. With eyes not dulled by familiarity he could better appreciate certain original features in American thought. On the other hand, a foreign observer inevitably has certain alien preconceptions which do not fit the new environment. He may, as in this case, miss the subtle significance of many doctrinal differences.

The author's range of reading has been remarkable; he has probed into many corners for material not usually recognized as having economic bearings. Interesting quotations from these various sources comprise a goodly portion of the text. The critical comments are frequently just and penetrating. However, the "Spirit" the author thinks he discovers running through American economics and which he most admires is an advocacy of governmental action and favoritism to special pressure groups to supplement or displace private enterprise. Thus he has only praise for the ante-bellum so-called nationalist school advocating restrictive tariffs, long led by the Careys, father and son. He sees in their teaching not a crude mercantilism and a greedy grasping for special favors to the manufacturing class. He takes them at their own valuation, as disinterestedly offering a wise philosophy of national welfare. In the more recent period his chief admiration goes to Thorstein Veblen for his exposure of the weaknesses of capitalism and to a reputedly existing school of institutionalists following Veblen's leadership. In general the author champions what he calls "the principle of transformation" rather than "the principle of conservation" in economic society. He is really not much interested in basic economic theory as such but only in its possible applications in support of more bureaucratic policies. Readers will find this a provocative book, and some, probably, a provoking one.

The Canadian supplement is a brief, well-written account of the development in Canada not of economic theory but of national sentiment. Almost the only economic ideas discussed are those affecting the policies of a restrictive tariff and of federal public works, both of which the author seems to favor as tools of Canadian nationalism. The supplement is in essential harmony with the main essay.

Princeton University

FRANK ALBERT FETTER

RELIGION IN COLONIAL AMERICA. By *William Warren Sweet*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1942. Pp. xiii, 367. \$3.00.)

"THE purpose of this volume," opens the author's preface, "is to place religion in its proper perspective in American colonial history." Nowhere is this "proper perspective" defined. But the author has in mind the desire to help remedy the

allegedly "lamentable situation" wherein the "average college student could pass a better examination in Greek mythology than on American Church history." To further this more modest aim, ten chapters trace the outlines of religious developments in the English colonies from the "Religious Motives in American Colonization" to a sketchy treatment of the post-Revolutionary religious settlements. Except for a brief glance in the final chapter at "The Unchurched Liberals," the author is concerned with organized religion, *i.e.*, with the churches, their transplantation, their leaders, their sectarian differences, and their development. The treatment is based principally upon secondary sources.

It appears unfortunate to the present reviewer that the thesis advanced in the author's preface (pp. vii-viii) becomes almost lost in the mass of narrative detail in the volume. Briefly stated, the thesis holds that, until about 1660, the "dominant religious groups in America" were merely transplanted bodies representing "the conservative wing of the Protestant Reformation." They brought to America "the European tradition of Church-State relationship," save in Rhode Island and Maryland. After 1660, however, "liberalizing influences began to operate," and "left wing religious groups" changed the picture until in the eighteenth century "a distinctively American religious scene began to appear," with a more "democratized" Christianity, separation of church and state, and an extension of religious freedom. Whether or not the thesis is sound in every detail (and the author confuses the reader by suggesting [p. vii] that the Puritans were a conservative wing of Protestants and later [p. 18] referring to them as "left-wing elements" in the English Reformation), it is worthy of a more pointed treatment than is permitted by the catalogue of sectarian developments which takes up the bulk of the volume.

In spite of the multiplication of sections—embracing even such relatively unimportant sects as the Ephrata Society and the Schwenkfelders—there are some regrettable omissions in the book. Though no one can deny the contention (p. 9) that "Colonial Protestantism as a whole was little interested in the Christianization of the 'infidel,'" the self-sacrificing lifework of such men as John Eliot deserves greater attention and the New England Company is surely worthy of mention. The existence of a series of excellent recent studies on the New England mind may explain, but can hardly justify, a truncated treatment of "Puritan Theology" (pp. 98 ff.) to the exclusion of similar accounts of colonial Anglicanism, Quakerism, and other dominant groups. Again, anyone familiar with the tortuous religious history of early Maine and New Hampshire can sympathize with a desire to ignore these troublesome areas; but their omission is difficult to reconcile with the more inclusive concern for other sections. Further, to center the "principal developments" in New England Congregationalism in the era 1690-1730 about the name of Increase Mather (pp. 109 ff.) is too narrow a base and overlooks the highly suggestive materials set forth in C. K. Shipton's "The New England Clergy of the 'Glacial Age'" (*Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXXII [1937], 24-54).

Though such omissions and oversimplifications may suggest that the volume falls short of being the "thorough and inclusive" work that the jacket blurb proclaims it, the book is a convenient synthesis and the best single-volume treatment of American colonial religion to date. The last two chapters strike this reviewer as the best parts of the book. Chapter ix is a splendidly lucid and concise description and analysis of the Great Awakenings; chapter x, on "America and Religious Liberty," sets forth excellent correctives for lay and clerical students and goes part of the way to develop the thesis mentioned in the preface—though this reviewer doubts whether the American religious scene is as unique by comparison with the west European as the author claims.

According to the jacket the book is "A Religious Book Club Selection." Perhaps the clergy of the nation may find time to read at least the final chapter. It will enable them belatedly to correct the annual Thanksgiving sermons which so often misinterpret that "religious liberty" which the Pilgrims sought at Plymouth.

University of Illinois

RAYMOND P. STEARNS

THE SOUL OF A NATION: THE FOUNDING OF VIRGINIA AND THE PROJECTION OF NEW ENGLAND. By *Matthew Page Andrews*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1943. Pp. xiii, 378. \$3.50.)

THE publisher's blurb describes this volume as "a landmark in the history of Colonial America," attributes to it "an entirely new conception and interpretation of the beginnings of this nation," and credits the author with "twenty years' effort in locating, collating and evaluating new, old and neglected material on American beginnings."

To speak more exactly, Mr. Andrews has worked industriously through such familiar sources as the writings of Hariot, Lane, Hakluyt, Smith, Wingfield, Strachey, Whitaker, Hamor, and Purchas and the equally well-known collections of Force, Lefroy, Brown, and Kingsbury. From these he has chosen well in putting together a narrative that is dignified and often entertaining, but his chronicle is as familiar as are the sources from which it is drawn. The interpretation is new only in the sense that it seeks to give new currency to a very old and repeatedly discredited thesis.

The theme of Virginia's settlement (and it is with Virginia, despite the title, that the author is almost exclusively concerned) is found in idealistic as distinct from materialistic considerations. To extend the Christian faith and to establish a citadel of parliamentary government in the New World—these were the high purposes which, in Mr. Andrews' opinion, shaped the colony's early history. No close student of the record will question the existence of a serious missionary interest, nor will anyone challenge the significance in American history of the establishment of the Virginia assembly; but the general thesis does altogether too much violence to the record. The dominant influence of Sir Thomas Smith and

other London merchants through a large part of the company's existence cannot, of course, be entirely ignored, and so an attempt is made to discredit this leadership on the apparent assumption that to discredit it is to reduce its significance. A serious injustice is done Sir Thomas, while Sir Edwin Sandys' influence is exaggerated. The whole story is distorted by reading back into the earlier period factional divisions among the adventurers that did not exist until later years, and by interpreting the company's factionalism in terms of a difference of political opinion. The trouble arises from the author's apparent disinclination to admit that an economic interest is worthy, or that it can be combined with idealism. He correctly draws a distinction between colonization and such commercial ventures as that of the East India Company but takes an assertion of the fact as a sufficient excuse for an imperfect study of the development of the corporate structure of the company and of related economic problems. He thus misses an opportunity to contribute to a better understanding of the origins of representative government in this country. For whether its origins be sought in Virginia or in Massachusetts, the effort requires a better understanding of the institutional usages of England's mercantile community than Mr. Andrews has acquired. Space does not permit a full listing of the erroneous and superficial conclusions upon which the thesis is built. The theme was developed by Alexander Brown nearly half a century ago, and its rejection by later students may be followed through what is now a rather extensive bibliography.

It is not intended to be too severe with Mr. Andrews, for his instinct is sounder than his scholarship. There has been of recent years a tendency to over-emphasize the economic motivation of Virginia's settlement to the neglect of other sides of the story. There is need for correction, but nothing less will do than that which has substance and the backing of the latest and soundest scholarship. The author is badly in need of a better acquaintance with the writings of British authors who have done much to bring the background of our history into a truer perspective. And he could reread with profit the chapters of the late Professor C. M. Andrews.

New York University

WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES. By *Mary Patterson Clarke*, Professor of History in Beaver College. [Yale Historical Publications, Leonard Woods Labaree, Editor, Miscellany, XLIV.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1943. Pp. xi, 303. \$3.00.)

EVERYONE who has sat in one of the late Professor Andrews' seminars in colonial institutional history will read this book with nostalgia. Professor Andrews used to assign a colony to each member of the class. We searched through the journals of our particular colonial assembly to find answers to such questions as these: Did the speaker always petition for a grant of privilege? For what privi-

leges did he ask? Did the assembly defend its privileges by punishing offenders? What control did it maintain over the conduct and qualifications of its members? For a month or more the class would dig in the records. Every fact it turned up, no matter how slight, would be duly reported. We all got the feeling that by that process we were actually contributing something new to an unknown problem of immense significance. Out of those seminars came not merely good books but a sense of the excitement of scholarship, of its comradeship, and of its permanent and abiding importance.

Miss Clarke has stretched that month's introduction to the subject of privilege into a patient search of many years. Where we managed to find one precedent, she has turned up twenty. Where we announced in triumph that in our colony the assembly compelled a man who had maligned it to beg its pardon, she, with the familiarity and assurance that comes from intimate knowledge of the habits of all assemblies—in the West Indies, it should be needless to say of any student of Professor Andrews, as well as on the mainland—proves beyond doubt the universality of the practice. She has read the printed journals with care, and where they were unavailable or incomplete, as for New Jersey, South Carolina, Jamaica, and Rhode Island, she has used manuscript journals.

It has long been known that colonial assemblies were as jealous of their dignity as was the mother of parliaments from which they took their example. Miss Clarke has made new points: that they assumed that dignity almost at birth and even in the seventeenth century acted as a high court; that they often followed that example blindly and with no notion of a reason why; that they might exceed parliament itself in the lengths to which they went, as when a Jamaica speaker forbore to ask a governor for privileges as a mark of royal favor but took them as a right. Thus her treatise has an importance beyond its chronological and regional limits. Most of her evidence comes from colonies where prerogative was upheld by stubborn royal or proprietary governors. The historian of representative institutions, asking what ingenious devices elected assemblies may develop when checked by other equally traditional institutions, will find here wealth of suggestion beyond his needs.

Newberry Library

STANLEY PARGELLIS

PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN LITERATURE: CHANGING TRENDS FROM 1683 TO 1942. By *Earl F. Robacker*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1943. Pp. ix, 217. \$2.50.)

THIS is the only survey of Pennsylvania German literature published that presents in concise, readable form the essential facts of the subject. Some earlier studies are too scanty, primarily because of the amount of space that could be devoted to them in a book or periodical conditioned by specific publishing demands, or they are in a style or format not suitable for the general public. One

example of the first type is H. H. Reichard's chapter "Pennsylvania German Literature" in *The Pennsylvania Germans* (Princeton, 1942), where Reichard's voluminous material had to be condensed into one brief chapter (a chapter, however, that could have given Dr. Robacker many good leads; he seems not to have read it or to have ignored it). Examples of the second type are Reichard's article "Pennsylvania German Dialect Writings and Their Writers" (in *Pennsylvania German Society Proceedings*, 1915) and Reichard's survey of later developments in his "Dialect Anthology" (in *Pennsylvania German Society Proceedings*, 1940). Leaning heavily on Reichard, Robacker sifts and sorts his source material so as to give an intelligent reader a clear picture of the development and present status of Pennsylvania German literature and its place in the larger field of American literature.

Dr. Robacker divides the Pennsylvania German literature into five logically if somewhat arbitrarily defined periods—but what classification could escape being arbitrary from one point of view or the other? "The Period of Greatest Religious Significance, 1683 to 1800"; "The Period of Transition, 1800 to 1861"; "The Language-Conscious Period, 1861 to 1902"; "The Local Color Period, 1902 to 1928"; "The Folk-Conscious Period, 1928—."

Dr. Robacker emphasizes the fact that the student of Pennsylvania German literature must take into account not only the Pennsylvania German dialect but also literary High German and English. I feel that the material on English works by or about the Pennsylvania Germans has been adequately covered for a survey of this type but cannot say this about High German works. It is too meager, especially for the nineteenth century. Dr. Robacker is, however, to be excused for this neglect, because of the fact that the whole field of High German literature among the Pennsylvania Germans in the nineteenth century—the century of the literary emergence of the Pennsylvania German popular language—has yet to be investigated thoroughly. Yet there is much relatively good High German literary material written by Pennsylvania Germans that is buried in the old newspapers. To be sure it is often difficult to distinguish between European-German and American-German contributions, but it can be done. My own study "Der Bauernfreund, a Newspaper of the Pennsylvania Germans" (*Bulletin of the Historical Society of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania*, 1940), might have thrown some light on the problem.

One example of Dr. Robacker's failure to use primary source material on Pennsylvania High German is his discussion on page 73 of the "Verein der deutschen Presse." If, instead of relying on the two secondary sources quoted, he had examined English and German newspapers from about the year 1830 to 1870, he would have realized how much is to be done before conclusive deductions can be made in this particular field. That the German newspapers themselves must be reckoned with until after the turn of the century is proved by the fact that newspaper directories, such as that of the reliable N. W. Ayer and Sons (Philadel-

phia), list many German newspapers in typical Pennsylvania German *small* towns as having circulations larger than those of the English ones there, even as late as 1900 and after.

However, by the time Dr. Robacker revises his book or a new survey appears, there may be more material available on the High German phase of Pennsylvania German literary activity.

It seems to me that Dr. Robacker approaches very gingerly any real criticism, from the literary point of view, of Pennsylvania German dialect literature. Men like Birmelin and Moll certainly should receive all the credit due them, but the myriads of writers, living and dead, whose work shows up as a Pennsylvania German mixture of Harbaugh with Edgar Guest ought to receive, in a history of literature, either no mention or a definite snub. I, for one, am tired of sugary, limping verse extolling the old farm, the old school, or the old, antiquated pump. Or, is Pennsylvania German literature, as a minority literature, beyond such criticism as American literature in general must endure?

If I ever teach Pennsylvania German literature or evaluate it in a class for comparative literature, I shall certainly use this book.

Lehigh University

RALPH CHARLES WOOD

ORIGINS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. By *John C. Miller*. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1943. Pp. xiv, 519. \$3.50.)

THIS volume, which covers the years from 1763 through 1776, is understood to be the first of three on the period to 1788. Within his central theme of ideological conflict Professor Miller's preoccupation is especially with the Revolutionary dynamics of popular opinion. "Ideas," he writes (p. 167), "were the weapons with which Englishmen and Americans fought for a decade before they resorted to arms." The genetics of Revolutionary doctrine are lightly passed over. In the author's view (see p. 170) "American political thinking was largely an exegesis upon Locke." For want of preface or introduction one can only guess at Professor Miller's conception of the significance of the larger period. It would seem that he does not intend to follow those writers who find the key in the federal problem and its solution. Otherwise one would expect greater stress upon certain constructive contributions of the earlier debates. Apparently he intends to emphasize rather the democratic implications of Revolutionary thought and action. While professedly studying origins, not causes, he makes it clear that he rejects the simplicities of economic determinism, prefers psychological explanations. His most penetrating analysis is of that emerging American consciousness of growth, maturity, and a great American future, which furnished the basis in sentiment for the American Revolution.

Both in its narrative and in its commentary this book is in the main soundly

developed in the dominant traditions of the scholarship of recent years, rather than brilliantly original. Its fresh impact comes chiefly from a wealth of illustrative detail: quotation and summary of contemporary writings, conspicuously the newspapers. Few students have read so widely in the English and American journals. Certainly no general historian of the period has cited them so copiously. Yet the topical treatment of the newspaper as an institutional factor is disappointing. Nor does the author in his diligent pursuit through the newspapers of ideas at work escape one of the hazards of his materials. The use of pseudonymous letters to the editors in analyzing opinion in the eighteenth century is a tricky business. To illustrate: views or arguments here attributed to "an indignant Englishman" (p. 33), to "most Englishmen" (pp. 441-42), and to the English Whigs (pp. 454-55) were all written, seriously or satirically, by an American agent.

Minor errors appear, of course, but this is a generally workmanlike history. One serious criticism must, however, be made. The author has conspicuously neglected to place his own researches in relation to the formidable body of scholarship in his field. There is no bibliography, nor any general acknowledgement save to the Society of Fellows of Harvard University and to Mr. Ellery Sedgwick. The footnotes, well over a thousand in number, are chiefly citations of contemporary documents from which are drawn quotations and illustrative detail. Yet on close reading it appears that almost all the important studies have been mastered, though there is relative neglect of the western aspects of British policy as developed by Alvord and more recent investigators. The names of Alvord, Andrews, Baldwin, Becker, Beer, Schlesinger, and Van Tyne nowhere appear in the documentation. Have all their significant contributions, of idea as well as of fact, now entered the public domain? Or are scholars as well as laymen expected to accept the publisher's claim that the "prime virtue" of this book "is that it is written almost entirely from source material, the first time this has been attempted with a subject of such sweep and dimensions as the American Revolution"?

University of Michigan

VERNER W. CRANE

THE MORALE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY ARMY. By *Allen Bowman*. Introduction by Arthur Pope. (Washington: American Council on Public Affairs. 1943. Pp. 160. Cloth \$2.50, paper \$2.00.)

DURING the Revolutionary War the motto of the times might well have been "Civilians First." The soldiers suffered and died; civilians, for the most part, busied themselves in making money, sometimes at the expense of the Army. Next to British tyranny Americans feared militarism, and they kept a watchful eye upon their own Army and its commanders lest the liberties for which they

had taken up arms be subverted by military dictatorship. Congress sought to keep the direction of the war effort firmly in its own hands, but it had neither capacity nor authority for the task. As a result American soldiers were obliged to undergo privations in the heart of Pennsylvania comparable to those experienced today by our troops in the Solomons and Aleutians. Washington was not overstating the case when he said in 1782 that his men had "suffered every thing human Nature is capable of suffering on this side of Death."

Professor Allen Bowman's timely book *The Morale of the American Revolutionary Army* is a study of how American soldiers reacted to these well-nigh intolerable conditions. As might be expected, their discontent found vent in grumbling, desertion, and, on occasion, mutiny. Apparently morale was better among the native Americans than among the foreign-born recruits; and certainly it was better at the beginning of the conflict than toward the close. In charting the rise and fall of morale, Professor Bowman finds that the peak was reached in 1775 (rather than in 1776) and that war weariness quickly followed upon the realization that it was to be a long grim struggle with little easy glory to be gained. At best, the Army offered few attractions to Americans: at a time of inflation and high wages the Army meant hunger, cold, and, very often, no pay. Patriotism, after the first wave of fervor had spent itself, proved insufficient to bring men into the ranks: bounties had to be raised until the recruit was assured of a tidy nest egg in the form of cash, clothing, and land. Perhaps the excessive bounties had something to do with the prevalence of desertion and re-enlistment: Professor Bowman estimates that "at least one third of the regular troops enlisted in the Revolutionary army" became deserters at one time or another. Morale, both among civilians and soldiers, unquestionably deteriorated: witness the mutinies which broke out during the latter part of the war. Yet there was always in the regular Army a nucleus of resolute men filled with unquenchable zeal for the cause of liberty. Most European officers were agreed that despite their unmilitary appearance and their disposition to clap their officers familiarly upon the back, these veterans were fighting men of the first quality. Certainly, they remained firm despite sufferings which few armies have been called upon to undergo: as Lafayette said, the American soldiers displayed "a patience in their misery which is unknown to European armies."

Professor Bowman's book is thoroughly documented and sufficiently scholarly to suit the most exacting. It shows an excellent command of secondary and the more important and easily accessible primary sources. Although it is little more than an introduction to a subject that requires a great deal more study and research, *The Morale of the American Revolutionary Army* is an interesting and rewarding book which brings into high relief the valor and sacrifice which underlie our existence as a free people.

Bryn Mawr College

JOHN C. MILLER

KOSCIUSZKO IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. By *Mieczislaus Haiman*
(New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. 1943. Pp. vii,
198. \$3.00.)

AMONG the foreign officers who aided the patriots during the American Revolution it would be hard to find a more romantic figure than Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Disappointed in his ambition for military preferment at home, threatened with bankruptcy, and heartbroken because of an unfortunate love affair, the Polish patriot journeyed to America by way of France in 1776 to throw himself with abandon into the struggle for independence. His engineering talent proved to be valuable in both North and South. In one of the last engagements of the war he barely escaped death.

Inasmuch as there has been little acceptable writing in English about Kosciuszko, the publication of Mr. Haiman's work is gratifying. The publication honors the sesquicentennial of the Kosciuszko Insurrection in Poland in 1794. For 1946, the bicentennial of the hero's birth, the author plans a second volume to describe Kosciuszko's connections with America after the Revolution.

Mr. Haiman has been careful to use practically all the available source material as well as a considerable number of secondary works. His knowledge of the Polish language is an indispensable asset. An adequate bibliography, illuminating bibliographical and iconographic notes, and several reproductions of drawings by Kosciuszko add to the value of the book.

It is regrettable that the results of Mr. Haiman's painstaking research are embodied in such poor literary form. The book is marred throughout by confused punctuation, bad grammar, and awkward expressions. The author has taken pains with references and proofreading but has overlooked some glaring cases of misspelling. While extensive quotations throw light upon Kosciuszko's character and career, there are many pages of the book which are hardly more than strings of such quotations. In view of the fact that most of the quoting is from the almost unreadable English of Kosciuszko's letters, it would appear that the author might better have digested most of this correspondence for us and thus have presented a smooth and readable account.

Parts of the treatment of Greene's campaign in the South could have been based more directly on the sources if the Greene Papers at Ann Arbor had been used more extensively.

But the most serious defect in the work is the hero worship bestowed upon both Kosciuszko and his friend Horatio Gates. Mr. Haiman's main interest is in setting forth what he terms "Kosciuszko's greatness." No doubt there were elements of greatness, but there were also obvious faults which should not escape a biographer. This weakness is not surprising when the subject is a character so attractive and lovable as Kosciuszko. But the unrestrained laudation of Gates as one of the great generals of the Revolution is indeed amazing. Mr. Haiman

laments that the "victor of Saratoga" was unjustly relieved of his command after the disaster at Camden "without even gaining the gratitude of posterity for his achievements"! The author is certainly not lacking in critical ability, as is evidenced in many parts of the present work, but his failure to apply his acumen more consistently is most unfortunate.

In spite of its defects, the work deserves commendation as a thorough bit of research which throws new light on the subject.

Marion College

ALLEN BOWMAN

JEFFERSON AND THE PRESS. By *Frank L. Mott*. [Journalism Monographs, Number 2.] (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1943. Pp. 65. \$1.00.)

THE greatest authority on the history of American magazines and newspapers has written a sound and useful little book on the relations of Jefferson with the press. There seem to be contradictions in the record, for the most eminent American advocate of the freedom of the press was deeply wounded by journalistic barbs and arrows during his presidency and then went so far as to say that nothing could be believed that was seen in a newspaper. The bitter letter that he wrote young John Norvell shortly before his retirement shows that he was not always philosophical. Later still he said something that was fully in accord with his earlier utterances: "Where the press is free, and every man able to read, all is safe." Nonetheless, he afterward stated that he had practically discarded newspapers and taken refuge in the classics.

In these apparent contradictions Mr. Mott finds no real inconsistency. "The fact is," he wisely says, "that Jefferson adhered to the principle, but was deeply disappointed in the performance, of a free press." He always recognized that private individuals could and should have recourse to libel laws, but during most of his career he believed it better for public characters not to avail themselves of this protection. During his presidency he began to advocate greater recourse to libel laws by public men, and, as Mr. Mott points out, he was to that degree inconsistent in theory. This inconsistency need not be objected to on philosophical grounds, in our opinion, however much it may be on practical; and in human terms it is quite explicable.

Mr. Mott does not claim that Jefferson was impeccable or invariably wise in his dealings with newspapermen. He was less than candid about Freneau, and, in the case of Callender, his native kindness betrayed him into a gullibility from which he afterward suffered grievously. On the other hand, he showed good judgment in his patronage of Samuel Harrison Smith's *National Intelligencer* and Thomas Ritchie's Richmond *Enquirer*. There can be no doubt that he contributed greatly to the development of the press in the United States.

Despite qualifications, it is better to remember Jefferson as a friend, rather

than as a critic or a victim of the press. In this respect, as in others, his experience fell short of his sanguine expectations, but he retained his faith. In his last sentence Mr. Mott aptly quotes the sage as saying, less than three years before his death, that he regarded the press as "the best instrument for enlightening the mind of man, and improving him as a rational, moral, and social being."

Charlottesville, Virginia

DUMAS MALONE

WILLIAM SMITH: EDUCATOR AND CHURCHMAN, 1727-1803. By *Albert Frank Gegenheimer*. [Pennsylvania Lives.] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1943. Pp. vii, 233. \$2.50.)

IN the cultural history of the eighteenth century few Americans played so vital an organizational role as did the Reverend William Smith, D.D. The Academy and College of Philadelphia, Washington College, the American Philosophical Society, and the Anglican and Episcopal churches all bore the impress of his leadership, originality, and boundless energy. That only Benjamin Franklin outstripped him as a patron of promising young men the names of Duché, Evans, Godfrey, Grew, Hopkinson, Rittenhouse, West, and Williamson abundantly attest. Smith's influence permeated the literature, press, theater, and organized philanthropy of colonial Philadelphia. And wherever there was acrid political factionalism, there was William Smith.

Here was a man of indubitable capacity, almost genius, whose signal weakness was lack of character. Able, arrogant, dictatorial, avaricious, and tactless, Smith was also slovenly in person, given to heavy drinking and great personal bitterness when opposed. He developed an unfortunate talent for political and episcopal intrigue. Above all, he never succeeded in inspiring confidence, even in his closest associates. In 1775, John Adams pungently described the clergyman as "soft, polite, insinuating, adulating, sensible, learned, industrious, indefatigable; he has art enough, and refinement upon art, to make impressions." Harsh though it was, this estimate still stands.

To write a balanced biography of this stormy petrel of Pennsylvania is a most difficult task. The provost's great-grandson, Horace Wemyss Smith, essayed it in 1879-80 and produced a monumental example of misdirected filial piety. Mr. Gegenheimer has ably rectified this error in his urbane, temperate, and well-written biography. Although he takes no sides, his attitude toward his subject is properly sympathetic. If one were to complain about this book, it would be on the score of overjudiciousness. On certain points Mr. Gegenheimer fails to come to grips with the issues, as in the case of the politico-religious contest for control of the College of Philadelphia during the Revolution. Francis Allison does not receive the credit due him for his part in founding the college, and the work of Smith's literary and artistic circle is not compared with the achievements of other cultural elements which were most active in Philadelphia. But, viewed as a whole, this is

an excellent biography and a sound and useful contribution to early American intellectual history.

Fort Schuyler, New York

CARL BRIDENBAUGH

NAVAL DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE UNITED STATES WARS WITH THE BARBARY POWERS. Prepared by the Office of Naval Records and Library, Navy Department, under the supervision of Captain *Dudley W. Knox*. Volume IV, NAVAL OPERATIONS, INCLUDING DIPLOMATIC BACKGROUND FROM APRIL TO SEPTEMBER 6, 1804. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1942. Pp. x, 587. \$1.50.)

THE resource and energy of Commodore Edward Preble, United States Navy, brighten the papers of Volume IV in the Navy Department's series on the *Barbary Wars*. Volume IV, covering the period from April 1 to September 6, 1804, deals with the final and climactic months of Preble's command in the Mediterranean. During this strenuous spring and summer Preble tested his theory that the only way to persuade the bashaw of Tripoli to respect American rights was to sink the bashaw's gunboats and bombard his castle and forts. Preble's sea blockade, however energetically maintained, had failed to bring a decision, owing to the fact that Tripoli enjoyed overland communications with other Corsair states. A more active campaign was necessary, and Preble had but few of the right kind of ships for waging it.

The resourceful Preble proceeded to improvise a force to do the work. He persuaded Naples, also at outs with Barbary, to lend him six gunboats and two bomb (mortar) vessels. The former enabled him to enter the shallow harbor and grapple the Corsair gunboats, the latter to hurl high-trajectory missiles into the town itself. The fighting in Tripoli harbor gave Lieutenant Stephen Decatur, already famed for his romantic exploit in destroying the *Philadelphia*, an opportunity further to reveal his brilliance in swashbuckling and heroic hand-to-hand action. A number of Corsair gunboats were sunk or captured. One bomb went through the bashaw's bedchamber; another penetrated the dungeon of the castle and narrowly missed hitting Captain Bainbridge, who was still a prisoner.

On September 3, a few days before his successor's arrival, Preble sent the ill-fated powderboat *Intrepid* into Tripoli harbor in a final but unsuccessful effort to destroy the enemy. Superseded at this moment by Commodore Samuel Barron, Preble had not yet had time to bring the bashaw to terms, but he had won respect abroad for the new American Navy.

As in earlier volumes of the series, Volume IV includes State as well as Navy Department documents. Considerable light is shed on such matters as business methods in the new navy yard at Norfolk, the maneuverings of American diplomatic agents in the Mediterranean, and conditions aboard ship in the early Navy. Rather surprising, in view of the Anglo-American rivalry which shortly involved

us in the War of 1812, were the excellent relations between the American commodore and the governor of Malta and British officials at Naples, without whose active aid Preble could scarcely have carried out his difficult campaign.

United States Naval Academy

RICHARD S. WEST, JR.

A HISTORY OF OBERLIN COLLEGE FROM ITS FOUNDATION THROUGH THE CIVIL WAR. By *Robert Samuel Fletcher*. Volumes I and II. (Oberlin: Oberlin College. 1943. Pp. xvii, 502; xi, 507-1004.)

THIS is another American success story. The ingredients are a humble and poverty-stricken beginning, hard work, persistence against great odds, high moral purpose, a passion for perfectionism, and inflexible Christian piety.

Starting in the 1830's, the institution's early years were filled with trials, reverses, crises, and dark periods of bare survival. While its zealous founders would never countenance a vision of utter disaster or extinction, long hard years filled with unremitting labors, fortified by little else than faith in divine guidance, had to be endured before the institution's continued existence could have seemed reasonably assured to any impartial observer.

Professor Fletcher in these two volumes carries the narrative well through the early critical period to the time when firm ground and sure footing were reached by the builders of the institution and to a point where this college's present high and unquestioned position could justifiably be predicted by sanguine friends. Or, in a word, to the point where effort begins to be rewarded by assurances of success.

Any college with over a hundred years behind it will have traditions and distinguishing characteristics. The author shows that Oberlin is rich in both. First of all it "is a story about Yankees" who invaded the Western country, bringing ideas of "learning and labor," a zeal to enlighten, and above all a passionate desire to save their fellows from sin and perdition. Volume I deals largely with the dynamics of these driving forces and with the "distinguishing" convictions and causes which molded the character and career of Oberlin during these early decades.

Among these were the almost inseparable causes of learning and revivalism, abolitionism and an "anti-slavery church," the education of Negroes, "the campaign against war," the advocacy of women's rights, a health movement, the extremely significant pioneer development of coeducation, resistance to the Fugitive Slave Law both in theory and in practice, and a desire to proselyte widely its convictions in and out of season.

Such a program of protest and reform in its time and place could not help but make the name of Oberlin disliked and even despised and hated in many quarters. Certainly she could not then count many friends among the worldly and the urbane or among the cohorts of "vested interests." It was true, nevertheless, that without the consistent financial aid of a few men of means in New York City and

in certain other places the institution's life might not have been sustained. Notable, too, was substantial support upon occasion from money-raising efforts in England among liberal and antislavery circles.

Volume II deals with student life, the village community which is so much a part of the college, the educational development of the institution, extracurricular activities, all under the aegis of "learning and labor," the motif running through the years of progress and growth. Finally, Oberlin's part in the Civil War is portrayed and a concluding chapter, "Fulfillment and Conformity," brings the story to the threshold of the present era of this college's noteworthy contributions to the social, intellectual, and educational development of our nation.

Dr. Fletcher's research has been exhaustive, his scholarship painstaking and sound, his approach sympathetic and understanding but always objective and devoid of special pleading. The style is clear and pleasing. He has an eye quick to catch the humorous lights along the generally austere and serious highway which he needs must travel. It is an admirable work.

Cleveland, Ohio

LEYTON E. CARTER

THE PANAMA ROUTE, 1848-1869. By *John Haskell Kemble*. [University of California Publications in History, Vol. XXIX.] (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 316.)

ALTHOUGH Mr. Kemble had previously explored some phases of this subject in brief articles in historical reviews, his present comprehensive study comes at an opportune time. Ever since Balboa sighted the South Sea from some height on the isthmus, the Panama Route has had a place in the imagination of those who sensed the importance for any Atlantic power of communication with the Pacific coasts of the New World. One might say, however, that until Pearl Harbor the American public had taken little interest in this problem, except during two brief periods—the decade of Dewey, Mahan, and Theodore Roosevelt, and the period in the mid-nineteenth century covered by this book. These years then form an episode in the remarkable history of the expansion of the republic which has a unity which lends itself well to such a study as the present. For until the Oregon treaty transformed "claims" to concrete exclusive national possession, the American public had little conception of what it meant to have a Pacific frontage, nor did it awake to a realization that communication with those distant shores was a matter of national concern.

Mr. Kemble rapidly sketches the growth of our awareness to this problem, shows how this awakening spread from the underlying policies of the Polk administration, with California as a goal beyond any Texan boundary dispute, to a group of commercial magnates with a keen sense of speculative profits based on monopoly charters plus government subsidies. In successive chapters the author works through the maze of legislative and departmental details which resulted in the

formulation of a policy of mail subsidies under which several groups of capitalists undertook to provide communication between Atlantic ports and Oregon, with California at first regarded as a necessary way station. Much detail derived from a comprehensive study of the reports of the first steamship companies, from the current financial press, and from correspondence of the leading figures affords a basis for rather cautious comment on the men, methods, and business ethics of the times.

Later chapters and a very valuable appendix present the technical problems involved in steamship construction and operation at a time when these developments were just emerging from the experimental stage, so far as transoceanic commerce was concerned. The financial structure of the operating companies, as well as their policies toward their passenger-clients, receives careful, if necessarily pedestrian, treatment. More could perhaps have been made of the underlying problems—the significance of the subsidy system, already a potent factor in the building up of British imperial policy, the characteristic mid-century contentment with *laissez faire*, and the wasteful results of uninhibited cut-throat competition alternating with periods of monopoly.

Descriptive chapters on the ocean voyage, the transit of the isthmus, and the conditions at Chagres, Colon, Panama, and San Francisco are enlivened with some local color drawn from letters and journals of travelers and from the daily press. The story of the isthmian railway forms a separate chapter, with considerable attention given to the labor problems involved. The book is illustrated with reproductions of photographs of eleven different ships which show the progress in adapting the seagoing paddle-wheel steamer to the needs of this traffic. There are also two helpful maps, a characteristic poster, and views of significant scenes on the isthmus.

Mr. Kemble points out that the definite points of beginning and ending of his subject, which give it so truly an episodic character, were not really connected with the California gold rush, which for most people stands out as the central event which made the Panama Route so colorful. It was to establish communication with the definitely acquired territory of Oregon, rather than with the Mexican-held province of California, that the government first offered subsidies with definite requirements of type of ship and use of naval personnel to strengthen our hands in the new areas. That the gold rush would supply a volume of traffic adequate to support privately owned and operated commercial lines of steamships before the subsidy contracts had terminated could not have been foreseen. Even so the contracts were made with what the author feels was a meticulous care and at rates quite justifiable under the circumstances of operation as then anticipated. As to any event which brought the episode to a conclusion it was not so easy for the author to particularize. The transcontinental railroads which stole the passenger traffic and the mail contracts were not the sole cause of the decline of the Panama Route. Added to them should be listed the rivalry of other intermediate

points which it was in the interest of the railroads to build up, rather than take every westbound adventurer clear to the coast.

The closing chapter, "Significance of the Panama Route," comes as an anti-climax. In part this may be explained by the nature of the subject. Like the story of the China trade in the heyday of Salem, or the story of the Nantucket whalers, this story must close on a somewhat nostalgic note, because its importance and usefulness could not survive the rise of more efficient agencies. Nevertheless, one feels that in that closing chapter the author had an opportunity to knit together the strands of several factors in American social and economic life, material for which is adequately indicated in his previous chapters. At this particular time, when our national consciousness is (or should be) alive to the impending changes in development of world trade, many significant lessons might be gathered from the way in which our government and our leading capitalists handled one distinct problem. Mr. Kemble lets the facts, as he has selected them, speak pretty much for themselves. One wishes he had let himself go a little more. It is to be regretted that where the villain of the piece, Commodore Vanderbilt, receives so much space the hero, William Henry Aspinwall, is not made to stand out more clearly.

For if the misdeeds of the several syndicates of adventurers, stockjobbers, and railroad barons represent the evils of private capitalism applied to the solution of a vital transportation problem, then Aspinwall's Pacific Mail Company demonstrates the advantages which may accrue to the public from private enterprise conducted with little or no public supervision. Mr. Kemble enumerates the steps by which these pioneers in oceanic steamship service triumphed over great obstacles—not the least of which came from the ruthless struggle for monopoly profits. What we miss in the book many readers will perhaps be able to supply for themselves—a correlation of the factors which characterized the problems of the Panama Route with the social-economic policies and theories of the time. Books such as Mr. Bernard DeVoto has given us serve to confirm an already prevalent feeling that not only his "critical year" but the succeeding decade were dominated by the overland trek as the prime way of expressing manifest destiny. This study of the Panama Route will serve to correct that conception.

Harvard University

PHILIP P. CHASE

AMERICAN NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS. By *Herbert Aptheker*. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Number 501.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 409. \$4.50.)

THIS volume is clearly the result of tireless industry and tremendous research. The elaborate documentation and the extensive and valuable bibliography of source and secondary material both bear witness to the long path the author has followed.

In his study of the Turner Rebellion, Mr. Aptheker reached the conclusion that the "event was not an isolated . . . phenomenon, but the culmination of a series of slave conspiracies and revolts which had occurred in the immediate past." Thinking that the same thing might be true of the Gabriel and Vesey insurrections, he undertook this study of the whole subject, which appears to be primarily concerned with proving that Negro slaves in general were neither docile nor contented but that "discontent and rebelliousness were . . . characteristic of American Negro slaves."

In my judgment he fails completely to prove his thesis. He exaggerates the rebellious character of the slaves quite as much as most writers have magnified their docility. He apparently accepts every rumor as fact, and most of the study deals with rumor, much of it of doubtful origin and most of it unverified. Many of these rumors are now known not to be true. Every newspaper reference to a rumor is cited as evidence of revolt or threatened revolt. To accept the statements of such periodicals as the *Liberator* and the *New York Tribune*, and the material contained in the speeches of the antislavery orators and abolitionist writers, is quite as absurd today as it would be to rely upon the Biblical bolstering of slavery by Southern clerical defenders of the institution as authoritative. It is no less absurd to swallow whole every rumor that found its way into print or manuscript in the jittery South.

Mr. Aptheker correctly maintains that the whole South was, throughout the period of slavery, acutely aware of the danger of slave insurrection, that it constantly discussed measures to prevent the menace from becoming actual, and that rumors of revolt, or threatened revolt, were rife throughout the period. But rumors were not revolts, and revolts seldom materialized, just as rumored conspiracies, more often than not, had no reality.

In his acceptance of abolitionist descriptions the author seems to hold the view that the Southern slaveholders, disregarding the fact that they were human beings, regarded the slaves as merely animal machines working to make profits and, generally speaking, treated them with harsh cruelty. That cases of cruelty were not infrequent is of course true. They have always been found, in or out of slavery, wherever sadistic men and women, or those obsessed by greed, have had other people under their control. But the whole body of authentic sources proves fairly conclusively that cruelty was the exception rather than the rule. And, additionally, to put the matter on its lowest terms—those chosen by the author—seekers after profits do not chain, lash, starve, and otherwise maltreat exceptionally valuable animals on whom they rely for profits.

It is quite evident that the author does not know the South of the period of slavery, nor yet does he know slavery as it was. He has overlooked the sources that would have informed him and discounted the secondary works based upon

those sources. Instead he has studied the picture painted by Garrison and his disciples.

A somewhat constant reference to the author's belief that the slaveholding South consciously and deliberately debased a whole race for the sake of profits makes it not out of place to suggest that a contrast of the Negroes who emerged from slavery with those brought over from Africa, or with those there today, clearly exposes the fallacy of such reasoning.

Limits of space prevent the mention of numerous specific errors, as well as of several serious defects of arrangement, treatment, and interpretation.

University of North Carolina

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON

JUDAH P. BENJAMIN, CONFEDERATE STATESMAN. By *Robert Douthat Meade*. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1943. Pp. ix, 432. \$3.75.)

THE author might well have entitled his book "The Lives of Judah P. Benjamin," because this unique figure had almost as many careers—and was almost as lucky—as the nine-lived cat. He was born in 1811 on the Danish West Indian Island of St. Croix during the British occupancy of that island, and fifty-five years later, after having fled to England as a homeless Confederate refugee, literally a man without a country, he shrewdly and successfully claimed British citizenship on the grounds that he was born under the British flag. Benjamin's boyhood was spent in North Carolina. Here he received an excellent preparatory education that enabled him to enter Yale at the unseasonable age of fourteen. His career at Yale was brilliant, but on account of his youthful exuberance it was not creditable; and he voluntarily—though doubtless under unofficial pressure—terminated his studies before graduation. He soon made his way to New Orleans, where he turned his boundless energies and ambition to the study of law; and he had scarcely attained his majority before he was a successful lawyer and unhappily married. In a few years he had gained national reputation as a commercial lawyer and was earning a princely income. His great reputation soon brought him into local politics, first in two state constitutional conventions and then as state senator. In 1852 he was elected on the Whig ticket to the United States Senate, where, as colleague to the famous John Slidell, he served until Louisiana seceded from the Union in 1861. In the meantime Benjamin established himself at Bellechasse—his country place near New Orleans—as one of the most successful and progressive sugar planters of Louisiana.

During the Civil War he was Confederate Attorney General, Acting Secretary of War and Secretary of War, and, finally, Secretary of State, but most important of all the closest friend and personal adviser of Jefferson Davis. The author devotes more space to Benjamin's career as Confederate statesman but probably makes less contribution of fact to this well-known period than to the more obscure phases of Benjamin's life. But more important, he comes to closer grips

than anyone else has been able to do with Benjamin's personality and character during this tragic time and reveals him as a man of large mental and moral stature. A gifted organizer, he proved himself a remarkable Secretary of War who silently shouldered the blame for unfortunate events for which he was not responsible, while later secretaries received credit for what Benjamin had done. The author feels, however, that Benjamin was especially fitted for the post of Secretary of State and that, had he been able early in the war to offer the emancipation of the slaves and greater commercial concessions to Great Britain and France, he would have obtained British and French recognition and even aid. On the point of British and French intervention I cannot agree. Actually, Mason and Slidell practically offered the British and French free trade; and the British-Confederate sympathizers and propagandists in Great Britain created the impression that slavery would be ended regardless of which side won and thereby weakened the slavery issue as an important trading point. I do not believe that Benjamin could have obtained recognition had he offered Great Britain and France the Confederacy itself, for neither one of these countries was willing under the circumstances then prevailing in Europe to risk a war with the United States—entailing among other things the loss of all of England's great profits derived from the war in America and the failure of the French intervention in Mexico.

Benjamin's flight to England after the collapse of the Confederacy is a thrilling story which Meade tells very effectively. It reveals again the tough, unbreakable fiber of Benjamin's character, his cold, physical courage, his unfaltering cheerfulness and kindness under the most desperate circumstances. When he reached England he was fifty-five and should have been a broken man. On the contrary, however, he was simply at the beginning of the most brilliant career of his life. He shrewdly dug up his British citizenship, enrolled at the Inns of Court with a group of young law students, where he was supposed to spend about four years before being admitted to the bar but where he spent only a few months before becoming an English barrister. Seeing the need of a modern treatise on Sales he proceeded to write a text on the subject which received instant and nation-wide recognition. As in New Orleans, Benjamin quickly rose to the topmost ranks as a commercial lawyer—which meant far more in the great commercial empire of the British than it had in the United States—and as a specialist on appeal cases from colonial possessions. Soon he was earning near \$100,000 a year. At his death in 1884 the British legal profession regarded Benjamin as the leader in his field.

The author's patient and ingenious search for new material on Benjamin, his re-examination of old material, and his thorough study of the history of the period in which Benjamin lived strikingly illustrate the essential groundwork for a historical biography. This preparatory work and his literary craftsmanship, objectivity, and restraint have enabled Mr. Meade to write one of the most difficult and important biographies of recent years.

Vanderbilt University

FRANK L. OWSLEY

GIDEON WELLES: LINCOLN'S NAVY DEPARTMENT. By *Richard S. West, jr.* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1943. Pp. 379. \$3.50.)

ONLY two members of President Lincoln's cabinet served throughout his administration, Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles and Secretary of State William H. Seward. Of his thirteen cabinet members, extensive accounts of the lives of six of them have been published—Seward, Chase, Fessenden, Stanton, Blair, and Welles. Of these the most recent is that of Welles, here under review. The biographer is a professor at the United States Naval Academy, one of a group of prolific naval historians there. His life of Welles is a scholarly, factual book, written clearly and conscientiously after a wide reading of the sources of information. It contains much that is new and is the best account extant on naval administration during the Civil War. He does not include a bibliography but gives in his notes a full list of references to his numerous quotations. His chief manuscript sources are the Gideon Welles Papers, of which "Correspondence" alone comprises seventy volumes, and the Welles Diary—both in the Library of Congress; family papers in the possession of Mr. Thomas Welles, South Coventry, Connecticut; records in the Navy Department and the National Archives; and papers in New York libraries. His chief published sources are the three-volume *Diary* and other writings of Welles, *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies*, congressional documents, *Confidential Correspondence of Gustavus Vasa Fox*, and Hartford and New York City newspapers. The author seldom comments on his sources. He does include a brief account of the *Diary*, for which he suggests a more precise title, "Journal with Interpolations and Post-War Memoirs." He might have added a reference to H. B. Learned's scholarly review (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVII, 629-32).

If Professor West aimed to write a complete life of Welles, he has for the years 1865-78 fallen short of his aim. His main title *Gideon Welles* seems to imply such a life, while his subtitle *Lincoln's Navy Department* implies something more limited. The allotment of space for the three periods into which the text may be divided is as follows: pre-Civil War, 23 per cent; Civil War, 71 per cent; post-Civil War, 6 per cent. The allotment of 6 per cent, or a single chapter, to the post-Civil War period, for four years of which Welles was Secretary of the Navy, makes this part of the book quite sketchy. The Johnson part of the *Diary* is longer than the Lincoln part and has been described as probably the more important for political history, though the less interesting. Nothing is said about Welles's leaving the Republican party in 1868 and his attack on the decision of the Hayes-Tilden Electoral Commission.

The author shows much skill in sketching in the background and keeping it subordinate to the hero—no mean test of good biographical writing. Welles's character, which one would like to have had analyzed and summed up in a final chapter, offers but few puzzles. He was a journalist who liked to write and wrote a great deal, thus revealing himself at great length. Devoted to his family, he was highly critical of his rivals, particularly of Seward and Stanton. One goes along

with Professor West and accepts Welles's unfavorable judgment of these two cabinet members. One also agrees that the teamwork of the cabinet was most deplorable.

Washington, D. C.

CHARLES O. PAULLIN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY: FOUNDERS AND THE FOUNDING; SIX LECTURES DELIVERED AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY ON THE MESSENGER FOUNDATION IN THE YEAR 1943. By *Carl L. Becker*, Professor Emeritus of History and University Historian in Cornell University. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 240. \$2.75.)

THE seventy-fifth anniversary of the opening of Cornell University was commemorated last year by the delivery of the Messenger Lectures by Carl L. Becker under the title *Cornell University: Founders and the Founding*. The book is written with the lively grace that marks all of Professor Becker's work and illuminated with shafts of humor. The author's thorough investigation has brought to light new and valuable material on the history of Cornell. But perhaps the greatest merit of the book lies in the penetrating judgment with which events and persons are appraised. The review of the Morrill Act and the New York land grant and the characterizations of Ezra Cornell and Andrew D. White command unqualified admiration.

The first of the six lectures considers collegiate education prior to the Civil War, the old order which Cornell University was to help overthrow. The second lecture relates the history of the Morrill Land Grant College Act. The representatives of the Western states, although they desired agricultural colleges, had well-founded objections to the method of land distribution adopted. They predicted that it would give rise to unbridled land speculation, and the event confirmed their apprehensions. The absurd charge that Mr. Cornell was enriching himself rather than the university gained credence because of the disrepute of the act. The third lecture deals with Ezra Cornell, whom White persuaded to endow a school which might receive New York's allotment of the public lands. Cornell seems to have been unfitted alike by his good qualities and his defects to become a rich man, and it was almost by accident that he made a fortune in Western Union. A "tough-minded idealist," he was a man of tolerance, serenely self-confident, public-spirited and generous in civic affairs, impractical and parsimonious in business matters. To found a great university he needed as collaborator the subject of the fourth lecture, Andrew D. White, "this extraordinary man who probably had a greater influence on the history of higher education in the nineteenth century than any one else." White's crusading zeal was not inhibited by critical self-examination, but he had what was needed: "precise knowledge of the end to be attained, inflexible determination to attain it, and rare diplomatic skill in dealing with those who might assist or oppose him." The fifth lecture unfolds the story, gathered

from a number of sources, of the political dealings by which the New York legislature was persuaded to appropriate the land grant to Cornell University. The sixth lecture describes the opening of the university. Fifteen documents are published for the first time in the appendix.

It was a happy thought to include in the volume the address "The Cornell Tradition: Freedom and Responsibility," which Professor Becker delivered on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the charter. This is not merely an account of the Cornell heritage but a brilliant justification of free inquiry. Yet no single essay could be so satisfactory a vindication of the liberal tradition as has been the entire career of Professor Becker.

Potsdam State Teachers College

WALTER P. ROGERS

THE HISTORY OF THE STATE OF OHIO. Edited by *Carl Wittke*, Professor of History, Oberlin College. Volume V, OHIO COMES OF AGE, 1873-1900. By *Philip D. Jordan*, Associate Professor of History, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. (Columbus: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society. 1943. Pp. xiii, 550.)

"Nobody is interested in history after the Civil War!" Many Middle Western librarians have voiced this complaint and blamed the teachers. *Ohio Comes of Age* should dispel some of the prejudice against the period. An amusing frontispiece of a politician and his hangers-on, by Charles Dana Gibson, strikes the opening note for an entertaining historical production. The book's field is essentially local, yet the Ohio story is geared smoothly into the national cycle. Politically the period marks the beginning of the Ohio Dynasty. Presidents Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Cleveland, and McKinley were all from Ohio or states that join it. Socially Ohio moved in this generation from "Calvinistic belief in the dignity of hard work" to a recognition of "golden oak" furniture as the badge of respectability. Industrially the people changed from makers of farm implements to makers of heavy machinery. The author lists inventions of native sons that vary in complexity from a water tank over a train stove designed to spill and put out the fire in case of a wreck to ingenious laborsaving devices and electric block systems for railways.

With the growth of Ohio's cities came city problems—congestion, housing, slums, charities, graft, bossism, Hannaism, the full dinner pail. Professor Jordan recounts how diverse classes lived, ate, worked, and played. Cockfighting, boxing, baseball, bicycling, the theater, all are considered according to their apparent importance to Ohioans.

A writer who attempts to cover such a vast area is sure to make some errors. William Dean Howells did not write his biography of Lincoln four years after he became editor of *Cosmopolitan Magazine* in 1891, as the author says (p. 443). The biography appeared thirty-five years earlier and influenced Lincoln to ap-

point the Ohioan as consul to Venice. Livestock have given the author some trouble. He has confused Southdown sheep with the name of the hills on which they graze. He states that Durham and Shorthorn cattle are different breeds. He lists (p. 89) the popular horse breeds as "Morgan, Bellfounder, Messenger, Hiatoga, Black Hawk and the Flemish draft horse"—one breed, four individuals, and a geographical expression. The text leads the reader to assume that Percheron and Norman horses are also different breeds. This is particularly unfortunate, for these elephantine animals owe much to Ohio. Horses reached their peak of importance in the era of new wealth and old-style locomotion that followed the Civil War. In 1870 more Percherons could be found in Ohio than in any other state in the Union. Over 43 per cent of all Percherons in America lived there. Ohio men have always been credited with organizing the first meeting which led to the establishment of the Percheron Stud Book, published in Columbus. Demand for Percherons under Ohio's impetus revolutionized the industry along the Perche in Normandy. The Société hippique percheronne and its rival, Le Percheron français, were both modeled after the American Norman-Percheron organization.

The development of other topics in the book displays more research than is usual in a general history. The account of the nomination of Rutherford B. Hayes uses sources untapped by Williams and Eckenrode in their full-length biographies. The description of life on Ohio canal boats is drawn from materials not used by either Dunbar or Hulbert.

The book's literary technique displays skillful composition. Reference topics mortise nicely into a continuous narrative. The flavor of the era has been preserved with copious quotations from early newspapers. Apt stanzas of half-forgotten poems and songs enliven the text. The illustrations are humorous and provocative. Best of all for the lay reader, the author's style has both spirit and charm.

Illinois State Historical Library

JAY MONAGHAN

HENRY W. GRADY, SPOKESMAN OF THE NEW SOUTH. By *Raymond B. Nixon*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1943. Pp. x, 360, xiv. \$4.00.)

HENRY Grady was not only an apostle of good will between the North and the South but also a first-rate newspaperman, as the author emphasizes by opening this biography with a dramatic account of Grady's trip to Charleston to report the earthquake disaster of 1886. These interests were means to a greater end, the development of a New South, which completely dominated him throughout his short adult life—he died when he was only thirty-nine.

By the New South Grady meant a well-balanced South in which the Southern people should develop their raw materials of mines, forests, and fields. In promoting manufacture, for which he would accept financial investments from the North, he would by no means neglect agriculture. He was just as much interested

as ever the Old South had professed to be in agricultural progress, diversification as well as continued cotton culture; and in furthering this program he bought an agricultural paper and became its editor. In popularizing his full program of manufacture and agriculture he played a vital part in making a success of two great expositions held in Atlanta. To awaken the South to a fuller understanding of current world thought, he brought the Chautauqua movement to Georgia. But his complete purpose could never be realized unless he could restore Northern confidence in the South, and this he greatly promoted by his matchless speeches in New York and Boston. As a part of this specific aim, as well as in the name of simple honesty, he tackled the race problem and sought to show the North that the South should have first chance to solve it. The Negroes should have complete justice, but Grady could never bring himself to believe that anything but disaster would result if attempts, as were then being made by the North through "force bills," should succeed in destroying white supremacy.

Not only by his oratory (divorced from all political trickery, for Grady never held a public office or wanted one) did he promote his New South but even more so by his remarkable work as a newspaper editor. Professor Nixon has cleverly brought out in this volume the full meaning of Grady in the Southern as well as in the national picture, and he has detailed the remarkable story of the growth of journalism in Atlanta, with the *Atlanta Constitution*, Grady's paper, as the focus. Grady's boldness as a newspaper promoter led to astonishing success—he brought to the weekly edition of the *Constitution* the largest subscription list of any such paper in the United States.

Blessed with many intimate Grady manuscripts and by a full file of the *Constitution*, Professor Nixon has found it easy and quite irresistible to present Grady as a human being—and few great leaders have been more human and humane than this prophet of the New South. Professor Nixon has written a sympathetic biography, though by no means adulatory, and what is more he has written a distinguished book.

University of Texas

E. M. COULTER

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND LABOR IN NEW YORK STATE, 1880-1900. By *Howard Lawrence Hurwitz*. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Number 500.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 316. \$3.75.)

SOME time, and at some place, there will be found the frontier where the right of labor to enforce its demands through combination and paralysis, and the right of the people to require a continuous operation of essential services, will meet in sharp antithesis and deadlock. The time and place, nearing perhaps, have not yet been reached; but they are now nearer than they were when Theodore Roosevelt stepped into the presidency and national responsibility; and they are far nearer

than when, twenty years earlier, he began to feel in himself the elements of a public character. As he educated himself to the realities of the American labor movement, so did public opinion inform itself in the years between the railroad strikes of 1877 and the anthracite strike of 1902.

Dr. Hurwitz has chosen for his theme these years, formative for Roosevelt, formative for the public. He has handled with intelligence and zeal the Roosevelt Manuscripts, the labor press, and the general sources. He presents a documented picture of the emerging labor movement in New York and of the jam in which political leaders found themselves as they were crowded between labor unrest and capitalistic complacency. It was, relatively speaking, a new thing for politicians to be confronted by organized pressure rising from the masses; they were accustomed enough to the sensitiveness of the upper economic brackets when in the presence of threat.

Theodore Roosevelt faced the labor question with greater possible range of mind and action than did most of his contemporaries, for he had freedom, with his secured position in all economic and social senses. While John Hay was writing a tract against labor in *The Breadwinners*, Roosevelt was being shocked by the living conditions of the cigar makers in the tenements. In the assembly, by grace of politics, he was already thinking of himself as of the "governing class" and generating ideas broader than those prevalent among the brownstone fronts of East Twentieth Street. As his career unfolded, between assemblyman and governor, Roosevelt retained a power of sympathy, developed a realistic recognition of the power of the labor vote, and easily assumed a sense of responsibility for a going government. There was little real contradiction between his readiness to maintain good order by force and his open-mindedness to the claims of labor; but he would not have been himself if he had failed to diabolize Altgeld. He was, in the years which Dr. Hurwitz has covered, learning his lesson in politics and developing that fear of class struggle which helped to impel him into the Progressive movement. He was too much of a statesman to be "willing to accept organized labor as a bargaining power with rights equal to those of employers and government."

University of California

FREDERIC L. PAXSON

GEORGE W. LITTLEFIELD, TEXAN. By J. Evetts Haley. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1943. Pp. xiv, 287. \$3.00.)

For many years the American public derived both entertainment and instruction from the shrewd and penetrating comments on current affairs, based upon "what I read in the papers" by Will Rogers, of beloved memory. All who heard him will recall with appreciation the peculiar flavor of his wit and the almost inimitable quality of style in which it was expressed. It was fresh and vigorous and penetrated directly to the heart of the subject in hand. It always gave a sud-

den and peculiar twist or turn to the judgment expressed which could never be anticipated and which constituted no unimportant feature of his attractiveness.

The source from which Will Rogers drew these memorable qualities lay in a background which is fast disappearing from the American scene. Only those who have had personal association over long years with the cowboy life of the Southwest can have any appreciation of the prevalence of these qualities throughout the region of their origin. Will Rogers was not unique at home. He spread afar and made other regions enthusiastically aware of the homely philosophy and penetrating wit of the cowboy. Much of this flavor has been preserved for later generations, both in the Southwest and elsewhere, not only through the memory of the Rogers' performances but by others with the same background and the same ability to give it expression.

Will James has made many contributions in this direction. The work of John A. Lomax in preserving cowboy songs and the ballads of camp and trail has been of inestimable value. In recent years J. Frank Dobie, of the University of Texas, has turned the legends, folklore, and traditions of the region into most engaging literature, with the same chuck-wagon flavor and the same penetration and unexpectedness. All of these have drunk from the same spring. They are the inheritors of a common tradition, perhaps the last of their kind.

Now there has been added to this list, in the field of serious history and biography, the work of J. Evetts Haley, under review. It is written in the same engaging style, with the same flavor and the same unanticipated turn of comment and judgment. But in this instance the cowboy has been educated, and while the volume retains the chuck-wagon flavor and penetration, it has also the organization, the research, and the expression of the scholar. There is a chuckle on almost every page. Indeed, and fortunately, it is doubtful if the author could write otherwise. His speech will always betray him.

Those who knew and worked with Major Littlefield and had some personal knowledge of the circumstances and conditions in the midst of which he lived and operated so conspicuously will hold in high appreciation the wide research involved in the preparation of this volume, evidenced by copious notes and references, as well as the dispassionate historical appraisal to which these materials have been subjected by the author. This has been no easy task, for there are many persons to whom Major Littlefield is still a living memory and who may be expected to be interested in, if not somewhat jealous of, the form in which his fame is preserved. As one of these, the present writer is of the opinion that the conclusions reached and the final portrait drawn, both of the man and of his times, restore them to life again as they were known to his contemporaries. The work has been well done.

What Texas has become, from the days of Civil War and Reconstruction to the present, is due to Major Littlefield and others of his generation with like foresight of the potentialities of the state and its resources and possessed of the wisdom

and ability to make these potentialities real. What Texas may become in the future will be due, in no small measure, to the agencies provided and endowed by Major Littlefield for the preservation and writing of its history and to those additional and essential contributions made by him to the University of Texas which give it a significant and, in some respects, a unique distinction among such institutions. This is no mean accomplishment to arise out of original poverty and lack of opportunity and gives the story of his life more than local significance. It is deserving of wide circulation.

The drawings and illustrations by Harold D. Bugbee are indigenous and delightful. The composition, printing, proofreading, and binding by the University of Oklahoma Press are excellent.

Albuquerque, New Mexico

ROBERT E. VINSON

THE THIRD TERM TRADITION: ITS RISE AND COLLAPSE IN AMERICAN POLITICS. By *Charles W. Stein*. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. xvi, 382. \$3.75.)

THIS study of the history (to 1940) of the traditional opposition in American politics to a third presidential term rests upon standard printed sources for the earlier years and on the Library of Congress collections of the Simon Cameron, John Sherman, Grant, Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, and Coolidge papers for the later period. They have been supplemented by newspapers (files of fifty-nine years) and a considerable, representative range of periodicals and secondary books. Its style is that of a rewritten doctoral dissertation, adorned with sprightly chapter headings and reproductions of lively political cartoons.

The author has summarized his thesis as follows:

The custom which limited any individual's tenure of the office to two terms was initiated by Washington, although purely on grounds of personal preference and seemingly without thought of creating a precedent. Jefferson took Washington's weary retirement from office at the end of eight years, added his own fear of monarchy, which the first President did not share, and deliberately converted them into a precedent which he sought to have observed by his successors and which Madison and Monroe purposely followed out. Jackson, though for reasons more like Washington's than like Jefferson's, preferred to choose his successor and establish him in the White House, instead of accepting the third term. . . . General Grant stumbled over the tradition at the very height of its power and prestige in 1876. . . . and . . . four years later . . . those opposed to General Grant "found the prepossession of the people against a third term so strong that, by appealing to established tradition, they defeated the Grant men in the convention". . . . Since the time of General Grant it has been all luck and no maneuvering that has kept the no-third-term tradition on its feet. . . . Not one man has been denied a third term on grounds of a strong and staunch adherence to the no-third-term precedent on the part of himself, his party, or the voters of the country.

Against this thesis, partly on the basis of what Dr. Stein himself shows, it may be insisted that Washington and Jefferson were not so sharply different in motives

for retiring, but that Jefferson was characteristically given to philosophizing and Washington was not. Each combined personal and public motives, but since it required two such actions to establish the precedent, Jefferson's action was the more conclusive.

The reviewer would also question the weight ascribed to the no-third-term tradition in defeating Grant's hopes for renomination in 1876 and 1880, and Hayes's achievement of a genuine electoral majority in 1876. The Republican schism of 1872 and the strong independent Republican movement thereafter found ample justification in "Grantism."

Over half the book deals with the twentieth century. What the author describes as "an exceedingly remote and no doubt unlikely hypothesis concerning Woodrow Wilson as a third term possibility" is advanced. Wilson, he says, planned from 1918 on to make inevitable his renomination in 1920 on a platform of support to the League of Nations. "He had no principled objection to a third term." Only his ill-health prevented him from seeking one.

Of Coolidge's course in 1927-28 the author takes a disdainful view. He prefers the unacknowledged hostility of "Ike" Hoover to the professed admiration of Dr. Claude Fuess when seeking authoritative information about Coolidge's sincerity.

In 1940 the tradition was finally defeated because of "the allegedly perilous predicament in which this country found itself," and because the Republicans refused to tap "the vast undercurrent of American public opinion that was still determinedly hostile to war."

Dr. Stein concludes his history with an appeal based upon its import. He would have the two-term rule restored or a longer single term for the President enforced by constitutional amendment, so that "the presidential office could not so easily develop into the shameful spectacle of unbridled absolutism, the threat of complete centralization would be averted, and the many stimuli which would be administered our rapidly waning democratic way of life could not be gainsaid."

University of Cincinnati

GEORGE F. HOWE

THE CARIBBEAN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES, 1890-1920. By *Wilfrid Hardy Callcott*. [The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1942, the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1942. Pp. xiv, 524. \$3.50.)

THE quest of coherence in American foreign policy, past and present, goes on within and outside of government circles. Professor Callcott claims that during the period 1890-1920 the evolution of a Caribbean policy was the central theme, as contrasted to an earlier mainland policy and the subsequent development of hemisphere and world policies:

Once its mainland territories were acquired and its national unity secured by dint of the trial of war, the nation began again to reach out. It is this first successful

overseas program with its trials and errors that is here examined as the prototype [*sic*] of the larger program of the next two decades and the still larger one of today (p. x).

The term "nation" seems to be intentional, since Callcott gives some attention to the attitudes of the public as well as to the verbal behavior of Presidents and State Department officials.

Callcott does not believe that the voice of the State Department is the voice of God. Such a critical attitude toward foreign policy is, to the reviewer's mind, healthy Americanism and not the sign of hostility toward the United States. It is, in any case, one of the minimum requirements of historical scholarship. Moreover, Callcott has diligently amassed an adequate array of detailed facts. His sources have been chiefly the private papers of leading personages, printed documents and memoirs, biographies and monographs dealing with his period. The captious might remark the absence of Stephenson's *John Lind*, Lockmiller's *Magoon in Cuba*, and Howland's *Survey of American Foreign Relations, 1929*. But most of the important literature outside of archives bearing directly upon Caribbean diplomatic episodes in the period has been laid under contribution.

The apparatus by which "national thinking" is ascertained is far less comprehensive. In extenuation it must be said that the task of appraising the public consciousness, past or present, is formidable. In connection with the problem at hand, it is unavoidably linked up with examination of the activities of non-governmental and non-diplomatic agencies in the Caribbean. Once the historian lifts his eyes from the narrow trails of State Department behavior, the forest, largely uncharted, is all about him.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Callcott does not present a convincing picture of the forest. Just what was the Caribbean policy that evolved in national consciousness? We are offered several obiter dicta not self-consistent, some of which, lifted from their context, imply that its essence was an "inevitable" expansionist ambition, domination for the sake of domination (p. ix). "The United States was dominating the Caribbean when and how it wished" (p. 491). This view has long been explicitly repudiated by most critics of foreign policy. Elsewhere Callcott says with more justice that the essential idea was "control of the canal and its approaches" (p. 213). It might be urged, however, that such a policy was Caribbean only as an important aspect of a broader concern for national security. During the period in question it must be largely inferred from behavior, a good deal of which was discrepant. The author has national consciousness to reckon with as well as action. This involves him, not very explicitly, in a somewhat dialectical development of his material, which may account for his apparent inconsistency. Possibly the most adequate statement of his viewpoint is found on page 495:

A national conscience had been created, largely in this thirty years, which would again adopt "democracy" as its watchword and cooperation in the New World as

its slogan, even while it insisted on supporting absolute domination of key military objectives in the Caribbean as a very minimum and was ready to include others when they appeared to be essential. And further this conscience demanded that the two fundamentals of self-respect and respect for one's neighbors so ably pled for by both Elihu Root and Woodrow Wilson should be retained as basic.

Whether the casual reader would derive this conclusion, or any clear conclusion, from Callcott's book is doubtful. The author's literary dexterity is not equal to his task. Page after page is littered with faults of diction and sentence structure, ambiguous referents, mixed metaphors, redundant expressions, and inappropriate connectives (such as "of course" and "while"). The reviewer has rarely seen a publication of an important university press so marred by typographical errors.

Wellesley College

LELAND HAMILTON JENKS

PEACE AND WAR: UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 1931-1941. [Department of State, Publication 1983.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1943. Pp. xxi, 874. \$2.00.)

FOLLOWING the issuance, early in 1943, of the 150-page, undocumented volume bearing this title, the Department of State has now released the larger edition. It reproduces what was previously printed and provides texts of 274 pertinent papers, about half of which are here published for the first time. The list includes diplomatic dispatches and instructions, memoranda of conversations with official representatives of other states, legislative acts, declarations of international conferences, communications from the executive to members of Congress, and press releases. Interspersed with these are texts of certain public addresses by the President and the Secretary of State. The documentary materials are in chronological order.

Especially if used in connection with other recently published materials of the Department of State—such as the *Foreign Relations* records of diplomatic relations with Japan over the same decade—this new volume on *Peace and War* provides much useful information in convenient form. (The Department's normal rule against publishing any diplomatic correspondence from another state, except with the latter's prior consent, is apparently less rigid in wartime.) At various places there are, in the language of the country's diplomatic leaders, general characterizations of American foreign policy (pp. 251, 333, 334, 414). There is some contrasting of the Monroe Doctrine with the regional schemes of aggressor states (pp. 79, 561). Liberals who lamented the course which the United States followed as toward Spain in 1936-38, or who disapproved of the permitted sale of American oil to the Japanese until the latter entered Indo-China, will find in the volume some indications of the reasons for the executive's position (pp. 419-20, 700-704, 820).

The record shows that there were timely warnings, from American representa-

tives, of the dangers from German and Japanese militarism. Instructive, for those who may have the impression that the State Department's policy has been over-cautious and timorous, is the record of straightforward talk from the Secretary of State to ambassadors of the respective Axis states (pp. 293-301, 623, 654-55, 758, 801), even long before the final dramatic conversations with the Japanese envoys at the State Department on the day of the Pearl Harbor attack. Worthy of serious consideration in the United States are many penetrating statements of Ambassador Grew concerning the enemy in the Pacific, such as his observation that "Japanese sanity cannot be measured by American standards of logic" (p. 775).

All of the happenings during the fateful decade cannot, of course, receive full attention in a single volume. The professional student of international relations will require many other records, *e.g.*, those of debates in Congress on the Lend-Lease Bill and of the manner in which public opinion developed on that measure. Students of the legal aspects of foreign relations will find various official statements as to the legal qualities of the Kellogg-Briand Pact (pp. 183, 276, 335, 376, 382); on such a question as the Hull-Lothian Agreement they will need to consider the Attorney General's opinion and professional comment which it evoked, as well as the text of the instrument. However, without emphasis upon purely technical points, the main events of the story are here impressively set forth for the information of the great body of citizens whose lives they have come so vitally to affect. One worth-while service has been to draw attention (pp. 257, 416-17) to the cost of isolationism.

The State Department's Division of Research and Publication has increased the usefulness of the volume by the provision of an eighteen-page index. It is to be hoped that the publication of such materials as are here under review will not impede the schedule for the regular volumes of *Foreign Relations* and the commendable effort to shorten the long time interval between the occurrence of events in American foreign policy and the publication of official records concerning them.

Duke University

ROBERT R. WILSON

* * * *Other Recent Publications* * * *

General History

A PROFESSOR AT LARGE. By *Stephen Duggan*. (New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. xviii, 468, \$3.50.) The chief trouble with this volume is that the title conveys no idea of its contents and their very great value to the reader concerned with present-day international problems. This is not an autobiography in any usual sense of the word. Professor Duggan is single-minded to the world scene. He has used his rare position at the focus of international education to get and give a better picture of the world's great nations than will be found in a half dozen more pretentious books. His position as the director of the Institute of International Education has given him an opportunity to keep his finger on the fevered pulse of the world during the last twenty years. Dr. Duggan's career as a scholar had prepared him, his natural interest inclined him, his repeated visits abroad and wide contacts with keen observers and students, many of whom reported to him in detail—all these placed him in a unique position to explain in clear English, country by country, the state of the world and how it came to be that way. There is, however, nothing pontifical or dogmatic about Dr. Duggan. I would put first his chapter on France, then those on England and Germany and the whole section on Latin America. These and others make the best introductions to international affairs for an American reader or student. G.S.F.

STUDIES IN GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL LAW. By *James Wilford Garner*, Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois, 1904-1938. Edited, with a Biography, by *John A. Fairlie*, Professor of Political Science, Emeritus, University of Illinois. (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1943, pp. viii, 574, \$7.50.) This volume is a fitting memorial to a first-rate American scholar. Schooled in history and political science and experienced through some years in teaching both, Professor Garner eventually became a political scientist and as such won renown not only in his own country but also abroad and particularly in lands like France and India, which he visited for the purpose of lecturing before scholarly groups. In earlier years he taught and wrote in the general field of government; and of the twenty-eight articles and lectures brought together in the volume under review, the first eleven are on governmental topics, ranging in time and subject matter from an article on "The State Government of Mississippi during the Civil War" (1901) to one on "Anglo-American and Continental European Administrative Law" (1929). In the period of the first World War, however, Professor Garner's interest shifted to international law and related matters; and the remaining seventeen papers presented in the present volume—all dating from years between 1917 and 1938—are appropriately grouped under the caption "Studies in International Law." A few of the latter studies have to do with problems of a technical nature, but the majority are on topics of wide and continuing interest. Professor Garner's scholarly acquaintance embraced nearly all of the leading authorities in his field; he had a thorough command of the literature of the subjects on which he wrote; and he had the gift of forceful and lucid exposition. The essays here published are a credit to American scholarship. In editing the volume, Professor Fairlie has supplied a biographical sketch which incidentally tells much of the story of the development of the political science department of a typical American state university. He also has included a list of Professor Garner's publications, a list containing some fifteen books,

together with articles, addresses, and other contributions so numerous that the titles alone fill close to a dozen pages.

FREDERIC A. OGG

SOUVENIRS D'ÉDOUARD DE MONDÉSIR SUR SAINT-SULPICE PENDANT LA RÉVOLUTION.—LA FONDATION DU SÉMINAIRE DE BALTIMORE.—LA VIE AU CANADA ET AUX ÉTATS-UNIS À LA FIN DU DIX-HUITIÈME SIÈCLE. Avec une introduction par Gilbert Chinard. [Institut français de Washington, Historical Documents.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1942, pp. 60, \$1.50.) In 1790 a theological student, Edward de Mondésir, was smuggled into Canada, from where he had to return to France three months later, by way of New York. He sailed for Baltimore in 1791, accompanied by the exuberant Viscount de Chateaubriand, the future great romanticist. De Mondésir spent twelve years in Maryland, alternatively teacher, librarian, and secretary to Mgr. Carroll. On his return to France he was in frequent contact with the superior of Saint Sulpice, Monsieur Emery. It was not until 1842, at the age of seventy-three, that he wrote his *Souvenirs*. The publisher, Gilbert Chinard, informs us that the present volume is composed only of "copious extracts" from that manuscript, kept at the St. Mary's Seminary at Baltimore. These indispensable details explain the special character, the restricted field, and the relative value of these memoirs, for the title of this pamphlet promises much more than the actual contents. In it are found several pages throwing light on Monsieur Emery's attitude toward Napoleon and piquant passages on the "fibs" of young De Chateaubriand. But, on the whole, this small volume represents only the very fragmentary and extremely desultory impressions of a young ecclesiastic, sometimes very severe and sometimes very enthusiastic. Mixed with pious reflections and Latin quotations, they reflect the inevitable vagueness and confusion of a text written thirty or forty years after the events had taken place. This retrospective booklet is not, however, without worth and interest. Due to their spontaneous frankness, these pages will be read with pleasure. They contain interesting details on certain French and Catholic feelings in Canada after the conquest, as well as on the religious atmosphere in the United States, where is seen both a generous tolerance and a nationalistic trend. It is a small document but of some real psychological and social interest.

GUSTAVE LANCTOT

THE FORGOTTEN ALLY. By *Pierre Van Paassen*. (New York, Dial Press, 1943, pp. 433, \$2.75.) In the midst of a global conflict, when nations and individuals are pausing to take stock of the past and make plans for the future, Van Paassen has, with all the fervor of which he is capable, injected into this recital of the tragedy of the Jewish people not only the background of scheming and intrigue that was yesterday and that may to some extent still exist today but also a glimmering toward a just solution for tomorrow. Beginning with a somewhat unrelated mixture of historic narrative, pathos, and philosophy in his first chapter, the author proceeds to tell of the struggle between Tsarist Russia and the Ottoman Empire and from there goes into the story of Britain's role in Palestine from World War I to World War II. His "Best Kept Secret of the War" is a chapter well worth reading for its factual data on the important part Palestinian Jewry has played in the recent battle for Africa. "Imperialism's Reward" paints a picture none too pretty, but "The Solution" pleads for an increase of population for Iraq, which, though thrice the size of England and Wales, has about one twelfth the population and could accommodate about 47,000,000 more people. Syria, too, could double her present population and so could Trans-Jordan, says Van Paassen. He suggests the settling of these underpopulated countries as a solution for Arab poverty, for relieving overpopulated Egypt, and for providing a food supply to India's starving millions. He proposes making them the food basket and

allowing Palestine to become "the industrial center, the laboratory, and the assembly plant for the new world awakening in East Africa and the immense new markets which the Second World War has thrown into Britain's lap." He concludes, "We would like to see some justice done!"

BERTHA E. JOSEPHSON

WORLD WARS AND REVOLUTIONS: THE COURSE OF EUROPE SINCE 1900. By *Walter Phelps Hall*, Dodge Professor of History, Princeton University. [The Century Historical Series, William E. Lingelbach, Editor.] (New York, D. Appleton-Century, 1943, pp. xvi, 406, xxxiv, \$3.50.) "The larger part of this book is taken from the last eleven chapters of *The Course of Europe Since Waterloo*, in which the late Professor William Stearns Davis was co-author. Acknowledgment is due him for the material in Chapters II and III."

EGYPT. By [*Georg Steindorff*]. (New York, J. J. Augustin, 1943, pp. 180, \$7.50.) "The history of ancient Egypt liberally illustrated with many fine photographs of its monuments and sculptures."

HISTORY OF THE JEWS IN VILNA. By *Israel Cohen*. [Jewish Communities Series.] (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1943, pp. 554, \$2.50.)

ARTICLES

LOIS OLSON. Pietro de Crescenzi: The Founder of Modern Agronomy. *Agricultural Hist.*, Jan.
HARCOURT BROWN. Voltaire and the Royal Society of London. *Univ. Toronto Quar.*, Oct.
DOUGLAS LLOYD SAVORY. Pope Gregory XIII and the Massacre of St. Bartholemew. *Proc. Huguenot Soc. London*, XVII, 2.

EVERETT E. EDWARDS. Rodney H. True and His Writings. *Agricultural Hist.*, Jan.

HELMUTH BAY. The History and Technique of Map Making. *Bull. New York Public Library*, Nov.

JAMES E. GILLESPIE. The Venerable Anglo-Portuguese Treaty. *Social Stud.*, Feb.

C. E. BLACK. Sorbier's Mission to Constantinople: 1807. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Mar.

THOMAS P. MARTIN. The Staff of Life in Diplomacy and Politics during the Early Eighteen-Fifties. *Agricultural Hist.*, Jan.

CHARLES LEE LEWIS. The Byzantine Invasion of North Africa, Sicily, and Italy. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Nov.

R. M. MACIVER. History and Social Causation. *Tasks Ec. Hist.*, Dec.

JEAN GOTTMANN. Vauban and Modern Geography. *Geograph. Rev.*, Jan.

RICHARD E. HIBBARD. The Emergence of Salonika as a Problem in Modern Diplomacy. *Historian*, Autumn.

KURT R. GROSSMANN. Judicial Evasions of the Peace Treaty: 1918-1932. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Jan.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT. The Peace Conference of 1919. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Mar.

Historical Aspects of Imperfect Competition. *Tasks Ec. Hist.*, Dec.

THOMAS C. COCHRAN. Theory and History.

THEODORE F. MARBURG. In Brass Manufacturing during the 1830's.

THOMAS D. CLARK. In the Southern Retail Trade after 1865.

HENRY S. DENNISON. In the Dennison Manufacturing Company.

C. ARNOLD ANDERSON. The Utility of the Proposed Trial and Punishment of Enemy Leaders. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Dec.

ALBERT G. D. LEVY. The Law and Procedure of War Crime Trials. *Ibid.*

Labor conditions in the Netherlands. *Monthly Labor Rev.*, Jan.

BERTRAND RUSSELL. The Future of Pacifism. *Am. Scholar*, Winter.

CARL J. FRIEDRICH. Military Government as a Step toward Self-Rule. *Public Opinion Quar.*, Winter.

J. B. S. HARDMAN. Labor in Occupied Territory. *Ibid.*

CLARENCE E. PICKETT. Handling Displaced Population in Occupied Territory. *Ibid.*

Economic Consequences of War. *Tasks Ec. Hist.*, Dec.

CURTIS P. NETTELS. Cost of Production.

CHESTER W. WRIGHT. The More Enduring Economic Consequences of America's Wars.

ALBERT GUÉRARD. Do not Dismember Europe! *Am. Scholar*, Winter.

CLIFFORD P. WILSON. Modern Developments in History Museums. *Brit. Col. Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

Ancient History¹

T. R. S. Broughton

GENERAL ARTICLES

H. E. WINLOCK. The Eleventh Egyptian Dynasty. *Jour. Near Eastern Stud.*, Oct.

LEROY WATERMAN. The Damaged "Blue-prints" of the Temple of Solomon. *Ibid.*

BOAZ COHEN. The Relationship of Jewish to Roman Law. *Jewish Quar. Rev.*, Jan.

GEORGE E. MYLONAS. Athletic Honors in the Fifth Century. *Class. Jour.*, Feb.

H. M. LAST. Thermopylae. *Class. Rev.*, Sept.

ROBERT SCHLAIFER. The Cult of Athena Pallenis. *Harvard Stud. Class. Philol.*, LIV.

H. L. RUSSELL. Tyranny and Democracy. *Class. Weekly*, Jan. 10.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE. The Greek Tyrannies. *Ibid.*

DONALD W. PRAKKEN. The Boeotian Migration. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.

W. C. KIRK. The Formulation of War Aims in Thucydides. *Class. Weekly*, Jan. 10.

H. G. ROBERTSON. Commando Raids in the Peloponnesian War. *Ibid.*

STERLING DOW. The Guardians, Socrates, and the Board "in Prytaneion." *Ibid.*

ROBERT SCHLAIFER. The Attic Association of the Μεσόγετοι. *Class. Philol.*, Jan.

DONALD W. PRAKKEN. On the Date of Hereas, the Megarian Historian. *Class. Weekly*, Jan. 10.

A. P. MCKINLAY. How the Athenians Handled the Drink Problem among Their Slaves. *Ibid.*

CLARENCE A. FORBES. Accidents and Fatalities in Greek Athletics. *Class. Stud. in Honor of W. A. Oldfather.*

MARTIN P. NILSSON. Problems of the History of Greek Religion in the Hellenistic Age. *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, Oct.

AGNES KIRSOPP MICHELS. The *Consualia* of December. *Class. Philol.*, Jan.

EDWARD F. D'ARMS. The Classes of the "Servian" Constitution. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.

F. W. WALBANK. Polybius on the Roman Constitution. *Class. Quar.*, July.

WALTER F. SNYDER. When Was the Alexandrian Calendar Established? *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.

CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW. Tiberius Himself. *Philol. Quar.*, Oct.

Id. Germanicus Caesar Emperor. *Class. Jour.*, Dec.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH. *Pietas and Victoria*: The Emperor and the Citizen. *Jour. Roman Stud.*, XXXIII.

HELEN JEFFERSON LOANE. Vespasian's Spice Market and Tribute in Kind. *Class. Philol.*, Jan.

J. M. R. CORMACK. High Priests and Macedoniarchs from Beroea. *Jour. Roman Stud.*, XXXIII.

CHARLES GREEN. *Glevum* and the Second Legion, ii. *Ibid.*

A. R. BELLINGER. The Numismatic Evidence from Dura. *Berytus*, VIII, no. 1.

MICHAEL I. ROSTOVITZ. *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* and Dura. *Ibid.*

GERVASE MATHEW. The Character of the Gallic Renaissance. *Jour. Roman Stud.*, XXXIII.

RICHARD GLOVER. The Elephant in Ancient War. *Class. Jour.*, Feb.

L. R. LIND. Roman Military Exemption. *Class. Stud. in Honor of W. A. Oldfather.*

H. C. MONTGOMERY. The Development of Humanitarianism in Roman Law. *Ibid.*

EVA SANFORD. The Study of Ancient History in the Middle Ages. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, Jan.

WILLIAM B. DINSMOOR. Early American Studies of Mediterranean Archaeology. *Proc. Am. Phil. Soc.*, LXXXVII, no. 1.

¹Under this and the following headings unsigned notices are, in general, contributed by the persons whose names appear at the heads of the divisions and who are otherwise responsible only for the lists of articles and documents.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ARTICLES

- THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK. Ancient Oriental Seals in the Royal Ontario Museum. *Berytus*, VIII, no. 1.
- PAUL ROMANOFF. Jewish Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins. *Jewish Quar. Rev.*, Jan.
- J. D. BEAZLEY. Panathenaica. *Am. Jour. Archaeol.*, Oct.
- FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON. Black-Figure Pottery at Chicago. *Ibid.*
- HOMER A. THOMPSON and ROBERT L. SCRANTON. Stoas and City Walls on the Pnyx. *Hesperia*, Oct.
- WILLIAM BELL DINSMOOR. The Temple of Ares and the Roman Agora. *Am. Jour. Archaeol.*, Oct.
- VALENTINE MÜLLER. The Shrine of Janus Geminus in Rome. *Ibid.*
- I. A. RICHMOND. Recent Discoveries in Roman Britain from the Air and in the Field. *Jour. Roman Stud.*, XXXIII.
- Roman Britain in 1942. *Ibid.*

LITERARY, EPIGRAPHICAL, AND PAPYROLOGICAL SOURCES

- ROLAND G. KENT. Old Persian Texts: IV, The Lists of Provinces. *Jour. Near Eastern Stud.*, Oct.
- GEORGE G. CAMERON. Darius, Egypt, and the "Lands beyond the Sea." *Ibid.*
- J. L. MYRES. ΑΚΗΡΥΚΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ (Herodotus v. 81). *Class. Rev.*, Sept.
- LIONEL PEARSON. Three Notes on the Funeral Oration of Pericles. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.
- H. N. COUCH. Emphasis in Thucydides. *Class. Weekly*, Jan. 10.
- MERIWETHER STUART. P. *Oxyrhynchus* 668. 188-90. *Class. Philol.*, Jan.
- Id.* Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, XXXI, 41. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.
- L. A. POST. A New Reading of the Germanicus Papyrus. *Ibid.*, Jan.
- R. M. RATTENBURY. Tacitus, *Hist.* i, 79. *Class. Rev.*, Sept.
- W. B. BUCKLAND. Gaius i, 166 "Tutela parentis manumissoris." *Jour. Roman Stud.*, XXXIII.
- FRITZ SCHULZ. Roman Registers of Birth and Birth Certificates, ii. *Ibid.*
- HERBERT C. YOUTIE. Diplomatic Notes on Michigan Ostraca. *Class. Philol.*, Jan.

Medieval History

Bernard J. Holm

THE LIFE OF GUDMUND THE GOOD, BISHOP OF HOLAR. Translated from the original Icelandic sources by G. Turville-Petre and E. S. Olszewska. (Coventry, Viking Society for Northern Research, printed for the Society by Curtis and Beamish, 1942, pp. xxvii, 112, 6/-.) This is another gift for those interested in boreal history from the Viking Society, once known as the Orkney, Shetland, and Northern Society. Icelandic history is always fascinating, and since it will soon be seventy years since Gudbrand Vigfusson edited the *Sturlunga Saga* for the Oxford Press (2 vols., 1878), the translators do right to remind us that there does not yet exist in English any version of this historical work. In partial fulfillment they offer such portions of the larger work as compose the subsidiary *Gudmundar Saga*, the life story of Gudmund, bishop of Holar in northern Iceland (1201-37), who a century later was surnamed "the Good" but whose fanatical activity and unbending character played a fatal role in the first decades of the thirteenth century, involving not only his own see but the Sturlung race and the entire island in unhappy feuds, and so paved the way for the final annexation by the power of Norway. Gudmund came from a noble family gifted with an adventurous and reckless courage; but the crushing of his foot in a shipwreck turned him from the path of his fighting ancestors to a career in the church. As a priest he gained a reputation for great sanctity of life and went about Iceland hallowing wells and miraculously healing the sick. Chosen bishop against his will, he soon quarreled with the powerful chieftains (*godars*) who had looked for understanding

and co-operation from him; instead of friendly and subservient he proved demanding and brusque. He raised a claim theretofore unknown in Icelandic courts, that churchmen should not be subject to the secular laws, and seems to have cast himself consciously in the role of an Icelandic Thomas à Becket, with the great chiefs and members of the Sturlung clan taking the place of Henry II. Able to win the blind adherence of some men, yet rousing the most furious opposition among others, he repeatedly suffered violence, capture, and exile, and many of his followers were cut down in bitter feuds. Devout and generous to the point of financial recklessness, he was implacable, unyielding, and unable to see the virtues of peace and compromise, till all Iceland wearied of him, and only death anticipated his formal deposition. The translation is capably done, and in addition to a map and genealogical table the translators have supplied two valuable introductions on Gudmund's family and on the development of the Icelandic church up to his time.

THE COMMENTARIES OF PIUS II. Books II and III. Translation by *Florence Alden Gragg*. With Historical Introduction and Notes by *Leona C. Gabel*. [Smith College Studies in History, William Dodge Gray, Hans Kohn, and Ray Allen Billington, Editors. Vol. XXV, Nos. 1-4, October, 1939-July, 1940.] (Northampton, Department of History, Smith College, pp. 115-291.) The second and third books of *The Commentaries of Pius II* in translation form the second installment of an extensive and altogether praiseworthy project. They will be received with gratitude by all students of the Italian Renaissance, and in this case there can be little objection to the definition of gratitude as a lively expectation of favors to come. The extent and something of the significance of the projected work have been noted already in this journal in a review of the first book, published five years ago. The unhappy Council of Mantua, called to organize a new crusade against the Turks, furnishes the central theme of this installment, as the pope's election did of the first. Here, more than ever, Pius is the complete humanist. Each stage of the long journey to Mantua inspires him to erudite comments on the Roman nomenclature, the antiquities, and history of the region. Once at the council he seems to revert in part to the spirit of the crusading age, but his optimistic reliance on the persuasive power of rhetoric is in the pure humanist tradition. Surely no one but a *quattrocento* scholar could have believed that three hours of faultless Latin would be sufficient to overcome the practical objections of the European princes to what they obviously considered a utopian scheme. The age when all members of the Christian commonwealth could unite in war against the infidel had passed, and Ciceronian eloquence could not bring it back. The use of the original manuscripts, from which many significant passages were deleted in the published form of the *Commentaries*, continues to add to the interest of the work, though none of the *expurgata* here is as illuminating as those dealing with the election of Pius in Book I. Three categories, however, all fairly frequent, are worth noting: unkind comments on the peculiar habits and characteristics of the inhabitants of the various cities through which the pope passed; expressions of strong antidemocratic bias, particularly in relation to Sienese politics; and circumstantial accounts of the vices of sundry princes, prelates, and condottieri.

WALLACE K. FERGUSON

HERBS FOR THE MEDIAEVAL HOUSEHOLD, FOR COOKING, HEALING, AND DIVERSE USES. By *Margaret B. Freeman*. (New York, Metropolitan Museum, 1943, pp. 61, \$1.50.)

GENERAL, POLITICAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL

WILLIAM M. GREEN. Hugo of St Victor: *De Tribus Maximis Circumstantiis Gestorum. Speculum*, Oct.

- F. DVORNIK. The First Wave of the *Drang nach Osten*. *Cam. Hist. Jour.*, VII, no. 3 (1943).
 R. W. SOUTHERN. The First Life of Edward the Confessor. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
 DAVID DOUGLAS. "Companions of the Conqueror." *History*, Sept.
 GEORGE L. HASKINS. A Forged Charter of William the Conqueror. *Speculum*, Oct.
 N. DENHOLM-YOUNG. The "Paper Constitution" Attributed to 1244. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
 HILARY JENKINSON. The First Parliament of Edward I. *Ibid.*
 FELIX GILBERT. Sir John Fortescue's *dominium regale et politicum*. *Med. et Human.*, Fasc. II.
 SYLVIA L. THRUPP. The Problem of Conservatism in Fifteenth-Century England. *Speculum*, July.
 H. G. RICHARDSON. The Irish Parliament Rolls of the Fifteenth Century. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND THEOLOGICAL

- A. E. R. BOAK. Christianity and the Fall of Rome: A Reappraisal. *Queen's Quar.*, 50 (1943), 235-46.
 JOHN N. HRITZER. Jerome the Christian Cicero. *Class. Weekly*, Dec. 13.
 FELIM O. BRIAIN. The Expansion of Irish Christianity. *Irish Hist. Stud.*, Mar., 1943.
 JOHN HENNIG. St Columbanus in the Liturgy. *Irish Eccles. Rec.*, Nov.
 SHERMAN M. KUHN. The *Vespasian Psalter* and the Old English Charter Hands. *Speculum*, Oct. [palaeographical].
 JEAN MISRAHL. A *Vita Sanctae Mariae Magdalenae* (B.H.L. 5456) in an Eleventh-Century Manuscript. *Speculum*, July.
 EARL J. KURTH. Bec and Its Influence, 1062-1163. *Hist. Bull.*, Jan.
 DAVID KNOWLES. The Cultural Influence of English Medieval Monasticism. *Cam. Hist. Jour.*, VII, no. 3 (1943).
 RICHARD W. EMERY. The Friars of the Sack. *Speculum*, July.
 JOSIAH C. RUSSELL. Richard of Bardney's Account of Robert Grosseteste's Early and Middle Life. *Med. et Human.*, Fasc. II.
 S. H. THOMSON. A Note on the Works of Magister Adam de Bocfeld (Bochemefort). *Ibid.*
 GERTRUDE B. FIERTZ. An Unusual Trial under the Inquisition at Fribourg, Switzerland, in 1399. *Speculum*, July.
 GEORGE SANDERLIN. John Capgrave Speaks up for the Hermits. *Ibid.*
 G. G. COULTON. The Last Generations of Mediaeval Monachism. *Ibid.*, Oct.
 W. STANFORD REID. The Origins of Anti-Papal Legislation in Fifteenth-Century Scotland. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
 JEROME E. BREUNIG. More and Christendom. *Hist. Bull.*, Jan.
 CURT F. BÜHLER. The Date of the Sarum Missal Printed by Jean Du Pré. *Library Quar.*, Oct.

BYZANTINE, MUSLIM, AND ORIENTAL

- NICHOLAS N. MARTINOVITCH. The Turkish Theatre, the Missing Link [the Byzantine theater]. *Moslem World*, Jan.
 HERMAN HAILPERIN. The Hebrew Heritage of Mediaeval Christian Biblical Scholarship. *Hist. Judaica*, Oct.
 SAUL LIEBERMAN. Raymund Martini and His Alleged Forgeries. *Ibid.*
 GUIDO KISCH. The "Jewish Execution" in Mediaeval Germany. *Ibid.*
 J. J. RABINOWITZ. A Note on the Jewish Execution. *Jewish Social Stud.*, July.
 SAMUEL M. ZWEMER. The Clergy and Priesthood of Islam. *Moslem World*, Jan.
 NABIH AMIN FARIS. Al-Ghazzali's Epistle of the Birds, a Translation. *Ibid.*
 RICHARD N. FRYE. The Samanids: A Little-known Dynasty [ruled Transoxania 892-999 A.D.]. *Ibid.*

LEGAL

- FLOYD S. LEAR. The Public Law of the Riparian, Alamannic, and Bavarian Codes. *Med. et Human.*, Fasc. II.
 F. MEZGER. Did the Institution of Marriage by Purchase Exist in Old Germanic Law? *Speculum*, July.
 GEORGE E. WOODBINE. The Language of English Law. *Ibid.*, Oct.
 WILLIAM R. O'CONNOR. The Origin and Development of Canon Law. *Jurist*, Jan.

- WILLIBALD M. PLÖCHL. The Fundamental Principles of the Philosophy of Canon Law. *Ibid.*
JOSEPH J. CHRIST. The Origin and Development of the Term "Tide." *Ibid.*

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

- AGNES ARBER. Spinoza and Boethius. *Isis*, Summer.
M. L. W. LAISTNER. A Fragment from an Insular Manuscript of Isidore. *Med. et Human.*, Fasc. II.
LOREN C. MACKINNEY. An Unpublished Treatise on Medicine and Magic from the Age of Charlemagne. *Speculum*, Oct.
H. E. SIGERIST. Early Mediaeval Medical Texts in Manuscripts of Vendôme. *Bull. Hist. Medicine*, June.
ELLEN P. PRIDE. The Origin and Growth of the Medieval Universities. *Social Stud.*, Feb.
G. L. HASKINS and E. H. KANTOROWICZ. A Diplomatic Mission of Francis Accursius and His Oration before Pope Nicholas III. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
HANS NACHOD. The Inscription in Federigo da Montefeltro's Studio in the Metropolitan Museum: Distichs by His Librarian Federigo Veterano. *Med. et Human.*, Fasc. II.
DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN. A Fifteenth-Century Bluestocking [Isotta Nogarola, 1418-66]. *Ibid.*

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

- IRENE SAMUEL. Semiramis in the Middle Ages: The History of a Legend. *Med. et Human.*, Fasc. II.
MARCEL FRANÇON. Jean Lemaire de Belges et Ausone. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Dec.
FRANCIS P. MAGOUN, JR. Otfrid's *ad Liutbertum*. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, Dec.
HERMAN J. GREEN. The Pépin-Bertha Saga and Philip I of France. *Ibid.*
THOMAS PYLES. The Pronunciation of Latin Learned Loan Words and Foreign Words in Old English. *Ibid.*
HEINRICH HENEL. Byrhtferth's *Preface*: The Epilogue of His *Manual*? *Speculum*, July.
A. H. KRAPPE. Avallon. *Ibid.*
J. S. P. TATLOCK. Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Vita Merlini*. *Ibid.*
LUCY A. PATON. Notes on Merlin in the *Historia Regum Britanniae* of Geoffrey of Monmouth. *Mod. Philol.*, Nov.
A. H. KRAPPE. A Persian Theme in the *Roman de Renard*. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Nov.
LEO SPITZER. The Prologue to the *Lais* of Marie de France and Medieval Poetics. *Mod. Philol.*, Nov.
GEORGE NORDMEYER. Zur Auffassung des Kurenbergfalken. *Germanic Rev.*, Oct.
GRACE FRANK. Proverbs in Medieval Literature. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Nov.
MENDAL G. FRAMPTON. Towneley XX, the *Conspiracio (et Capcio)*. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, Dec.
W. R. CUNNINGHAM. The Date of the "Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles." *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, July.

MEDIEVAL ART AND MUSIC

- C. K. WILKINSON. A Thirteenth-Century Morality. *Bull. Metropolitan Museum of Art*, Summer, 1943.
EMANUEL WINTERNITZ. Bagpipes and Hurdy-Gurdies in Their Social Setting. *Ibid.*
CURT SACHS. The Road to Major. *Musical Quar.*, July.

Modern European History

BRITISH EMPIRE

F. H. Herrick

- THE MAKING OF MODERN BRITAIN: A SHORT HISTORY. By John Bartlet Brebner and Allan Nevins, Columbia University. (New York, W. W. Norton, 1943, pp. 243, \$2.50.) The authors say in their preface that they are trying to show "that British history is in signal degree a record of the growth of freedom and representa-

tive institutions; of the achievements, under law, of both individual energy and social enterprise . . . that many of the American traditions spring directly from British ideas, institutions, and practices." Professor Nevins contributes the first chapter, entitled "The Significance of British History," which has no essential connection with the rest of the book and might well have been published separately. His statements are summary and too brief to convey much to a reader not already informed concerning the subjects treated. Consider, for example, two sentences that follow each other in the same paragraph (p. 22): "The Anglican church is a logical product of patriotic and religious forces working towards a natural fusion. The greatest of the British contributions to scientific thought, the orderly mechanics of Newton and the evolutionary doctrines of Darwin, fit precisely the general British cast of mind." Professor Brebner is allotted fewer than two hundred pages of approximately 330 words each to tell the entire complicated story of the past of Great Britain. It is no reflection on his ability or competence in the field to say that the result is scarcely adequate for any imaginable type of reader. Indeed, Professor Nevins suggests (p. 16) that the "best initial approach to this mighty record *is* as a vivid phantasmagoria, a series of tableaux," but his collaborator in carrying out the plan they jointly made offers a sketch more in the manner of an orthodox historian. The attempt to tell so much in so few words sometimes conveys impressions that the author probably did not intend. After 1688 England is, for example, described (p. 103) as henceforth "a republic with representative government and with a hereditary, but closely curbed, executive." The introduction of toleration for "sectarian minorities" is represented (p. 113) as "signalizing the separation of church and state for which Locke argued in his *Letter on Toleration*." A short narrative of British history would be useful for many types of American readers; unfortunately this little volume falls short of supplying this need. W. T. LAPRADE

MAIN CURRENTS IN ENGLISH HISTORY. By *Frank J. Klingberg*, Professor of History, University of California, Los Angeles. (New York, D. Appleton-Century, 1943, pp. ix, 209, \$1.65.) Out of the fullness of his knowledge of English and American history Professor Klingberg has attempted to trace and evaluate the main "currents" in England's past. His book is neither a scholarly monograph nor a text, but an outline, the product of his teaching, intended, as he says in his preface, to serve American students as a summary or as "the framework into which to fit their own discoveries and impressions." Believing that English history by its similarities and contrasts can guide us to a better understanding of the history of our own country and our "American way," Dr. Klingberg discusses British heritages, constitutional, economic, social, "the immigrant chests of culture," as well as the things which "did not take ship," and their modification in America. He tells the story simply, in picturesque language familiar to the ordinary American reader. Interest is sustained by frequent anecdote and quotation, by parallels drawn between English and American institutions and customs, by illustrative gleanings from recent scholarship. As might be expected from one whose major contribution has been made in the field of humanitarianism and the migration of ideas, the stress is on social history, and the best reading is in chapters dealing with social change in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The book is marred by occasional minor inaccuracies, especially in the early chapters, and by ambiguous sentences, due perhaps to overcondensation. Suggestions for further reading, based upon practical experience in the classroom, are up to date and should prove useful to both student and teacher. On the whole, the book accomplishes its purpose inasmuch as it stimulates interest and the desire for further reading in English history, presents fresh interpretations of well-known facts, and contributes to our understanding of the forces which have helped to mold America.

NORMA ADAMS

MINUTES OF THE SYNOD OF ARGYLL, 1639-1651. Edited by *Duncan C. Mac-tavish*. [Publications of the Scottish History Society, Third Series, Volume XXVII.] (Edinburgh, University Press, 1943, pp. xxi, 254, 8, 20, 12.) The present volume under review is the first of a series of two dealing with the activities of the Synod of Argyll from the beginning of the Bishops' Wars to the Restoration of Charles II and Scottish episcopacy. The synod was essentially a frontier organization covering a rather wild and lawless part of the west Highlands, including the islands of Arran, Bute, and the Hebrides. The frontier conditions are well illustrated by the activities of the ecclesiastical court. There were widely scattered parishes to be served and others to be established. The gentry who had appropriated lands of the old church had to be persuaded or forced to pay the salaries of the new ministers. Moral principles had to be instilled, rebels resisted, episcopalians curbed, and students trained for the ministry. We find in these records not only a picture of ecclesiastical life but also much information on political and social conditions in the west of Scotland during this period. The only drawback is that the editor did not include a map of the synod's bounds to facilitate an understanding of its activities. W. STANFORD REID

FUR: A STUDY IN ENGLISH MERCANTILISM, 1770-1775. By *Murray G. Lawson*. With a Foreword by Harold A. Innis. [University of Toronto Studies, History and Economics Series, Vol. IX.] (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1943, pp. xxiii, 140, cloth \$1.75, paper \$1.50.) This small monograph is a part of a much larger study of the American fur trade. The very condensed foreword by Professor Innis gives some idea of the scope of the entire subject and is almost as important as the monograph itself. In it he states that this study is intended to cover only a small gap in the larger field of investigation. This explains important omissions. The monograph has four main chapters, one chapter of conclusions, a critical bibliography, and an appendix which contains full tables of statistics concerning the importation and exportation of furs and felt hats during the years covered by the investigation. Apparently the statistics have been compiled from microfilm copies of *Customs 3* at the University of California, here printed for the first time. The author has confined his report to the British regulation of the fur industry and the forces back of that regulation. Very largely it is a study of the British hat industry, three of the four main chapters dealing with that subject. The justification given for this concentration is that furs were chiefly used for hats, especially beaver hats, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. "Throughout the period covered by this study, hatters' furs accounted for more than 65 per cent of the value of the English imports of furs, and for more than 45 per cent of the exports" (p. 65). The main conclusions of interest to students of the period are that (1) furs were mostly used for hats and not for clothing; (2) styles in hats profoundly affected the demand for furs; (3) the European market for hats was more important than the colonial during most of the period; (4) the total value of American furs represented a very small part of the total imports from the colonies, being only a little more than one per cent for the thirteen colonies after 1722; (5) the total exports of "fur" hats accounted for less than one fourth of one per cent of the value of exports from England. There is no mention of any important fur merchants or dealers in furs. There is no discussion of "skins" as distinguished from "furs." Customs districts are sometimes confused with colonies—New England is regularly treated as though it were a single colony. In Tables G and B, Africa, East India, and the Straits are classified as a part of Europe. Isle of Man regularly appears as "Isle of May." There is much in the statistics that is not brought out in the discussion, such as the importance of Pennsylvania as a source of supply for furs after 1750, the importance of Virginia and New England as markets for English hats during the

entire period, the large export to the colonies of foreign hats, and the reason for heavy exports of colonial furs from England to Russia. We hope the author will discuss these topics in future papers.

O. M. DICKERSON

THE MARITIME PROVINCES OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. By *Wilfred Brenton Kerr*, Associate Professor of History, University of Buffalo. (Sackville, New Brunswick, Busy East Press, 1942, pp. 172, \$2.25.) This is the second study in a series on "the colonies which did not join in the American revolution." Professor Kerr dealt first with Bermuda. Now he discusses Nova Scotia (which prior to 1784 included New Brunswick), Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and concludes that the "behavior of Bermuda and of the Maritime Provinces in this period indicates that less stress might be laid on constitutional controversies as a cause of the American revolution, and more on the growth of national ideas and sentiments." Prince Edward Island, with a population of about 1,300 recently settled tenants who were mostly old countrymen, and Newfoundland, a remote island which was then more "a fishery" than a colony, had indeed little national or American feeling; but Nova Scotia, where the great majority of the people were transplanted New Englanders, was a different proposition. In devoting more than two thirds of his space to Nova Scotia, the author recognizes this difference and the relative importance of the province; yet he underestimates the sympathy which many Nova Scotians had for the American side. It is true that Nova Scotia was "devoid of Adamses and Hancocks," but, as he proceeds to relate, it was not without its Revolutionary leaders in certain localities. In view of all the difficulties of obtaining outside aid, the isolation of communities even within the colony, and the apathy which such a situation encourages, the fact that even a few men in different places stood out for revolution indicates a deeper spirit of disaffection than Dr. Kerr admits in his generalizations, especially that on page 123. Although evidence of this spirit is not lacking in the narrative, it seems to have been largely overlooked in the summing up. The brevity of the book is one of the many indications of the time and care which went into its preparation. The text is compressed into 124 pages, followed by a short bibliography, twenty-six pages of concise notes, and an adequate index. Written from "the general view-point," it nevertheless contains much that is specific. The most notable contribution is probably the chapter on the intrigues for control of the Indians in what is now New Brunswick.

J. S. MARTELL

UN MONDE ETAIT LEUR EMPIRE. By *Ringuet*. (Montreal, Les Editions Variétés, 1943, pp. 350.) The author does not pretend that this book is more than a popularized account of the prehistory of the Americas. As such it is reasonably satisfactory, though many will look askance at the fictionalized passages that describe the contacts of Indians and Northmen and the arrival of Columbus. The novelist turned historian may well be prone to such devices. The subject of the book is a novelty in French-Canadian historiography which has kept almost exclusively to a consideration of local history. In this sense this book represents a certain widening of the intellectual horizon in French Canada. It is perhaps significant that it is a novelist who is making the break. In another sense this book represents the narrowness of the French-Canadian outlook. Nowhere in America has isolationism been more profound than in this area. If in recent years there has been a growing concern with the rest of America, this has in itself been an attempt to sharpen the differentiation of French Canada from Europe and to weaken imperial ties rather than an expression of any deep intrinsic interest in America beyond the bounds of the St. Lawrence Valley or, at most, beyond Canada. Since the fall of France in 1940 there has been an increasing effort to build cultural

ties between French Canada and the rest of Latin America, a more or less conscious attempt by French-Canadians to substitute Latin-American solidarity for the cultural backing of France as a means of survival in Anglo-Saxon North America. It will be remarked that this book focuses upon Mexico. Ringuet would appear to harbor a wistful longing that French Canada, like Mexico, might have a long, purely American background instead of being a mere offshoot of Europe of rather less than four hundred years' standing. This longing, it seems, has led him into a rather ridiculous endeavor "to annex the history of the land in which we live." The absurdity of finding the past of Americans of French, English, or other European stocks anywhere save in Europe needs no pointing out; and to recognize the absurdity is to answer the author's query as to why our students should know more about Macedonians and Visigoths than about Mayas and Aztecs. This book seems to me chiefly important as a sign of the times in French Canada.

RICHARD M. SAUNDERS

LYTTON STRACHEY. By *Max Beerbohm*. [The Rede Lecture of 1943, delivered at Cambridge University.] (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1943, pp. 37, \$1.00.) This is a charmingly written appraisal of Strachey by a discriminating friend and admirer. A few phrases of a general nature are worth quoting: "Even for spirits less fastidious than Strachey's, there is, even at the best of times, a great charm in the past. Time, that sedulous artist, has been at work on it, selecting and rejecting with great tact. The past is a work of art, free from irrelevancies and loose ends. There are, for our vision, comparatively few people in it, and all of them are interesting people. The dullards have all disappeared—all but those whose dullness was so pronounced as to be in itself for us an amusing virtue. And in the past there is so blessedly nothing for us to worry about. Everything is settled. There's nothing to be done about it—nothing but to contemplate it and blandly form theories about this or that aspect of it."

ARTICLES

- FRANKLIN LE VAN BAUMER. The Church of England and the Common Corps of Christendom. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Mar.
- F. J. MONKHOUSE. Some Features of the Historical Geography of the German Mining Enterprise in Elizabethan Lakeland. *Geography*, Dec.
- MICHAEL LEWIS. Armada Guns: A Comparative Study of English and Spanish Armaments. VIII, Appendices. *Mariner's Mirror*, Oct.
- DOROTHY MACKAY QUINN. The Career of John Gordon, Dean of Salisbury, 1603-1619. *Historian*, Autumn.
- KERMIT ROOSEVELT, JR. Propaganda Techniques of the English Civil Wars—and the Propaganda Psychosis of Today. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- JOHN W. BLAKE. Transportation from Ireland to America, 1653-60. *Irish Hist. Stud.*, Mar., 1943.
- DOROTHY ROSS. Class Privilege in Seventeenth-Century England. *History*, Sept.
- DERYCK ABEL. Liberty vs. Authority in Stuart England. *Contemp. Rev.*, Jan.
- HARDIN CRAIG. Hooker's Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, Jan.
- HOMER L. CALKIN. Internal Irish Organizations during the Eighteenth Century. *Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar.*, Dec.
- SYED MOINUL HAQ. Was Sultan Khusrau Murdered? *Jour. Ind. Hist.*, Apr.
- V. RAGHAVAN. Nasir Jang vs. Muzaffar Jang. *Ibid.*
- ERNEST CAMPBELL MOSSNER. Hume's Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, 1734: The Biographical Significance. *Huntington Library Quar.*, Feb.
- R. C. JASPER. Edward Eliot and the Acquisition of Grampound. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
- ARTHUR J. MEKEEL. The Quaker-Loyalist Migration to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in 1783. *Bull. Friends Hist. Assoc.*, Autumn.
- SAMUEL BERNSTEIN. Robert Fulton's Unpublished Memoir to Pitt: Science in the Service of Liberty. *Sci. and Soc.*, Winter.

- ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE. Lord Minto and the Rajput States. *Jour. Ind. Hist.*, Apr.
- HENRY DRUMMOND DEE. An Irishman in the Fur Trade: The Life and Journals of John Work. *Brit. Col. Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- HENRYK GROSSMAN. The Evolutionist Revolt against Classical Economics. II, in England—James Steuart, Richard Jones, Karl Marx. *Jour. Pol. Ec.*, Dec.
- D. G. E. HALL. English Relations with Burma, 1857-1886. *History*, Sept.
- REV. CANON CHARLES SMYTH. The Evangelical Movement in Perspective. *Can. Hist. Jour.*, VII, no. 3 (1943).
- JOHN LE PATOUREL. Channel Islands Institutions—Past and Future. *History*, Sept.
- D. G. CREIGHTON. George Brown, Sir John Macdonald, and the "Workingman." *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- D. C. MASTERS. Financing the C.P.R., 1880-5. *Ibid.*
- S. VERE PEARSON. Foreign Rule in Egypt. *Am. Jour. Ec. Soc.*, Oct.
- A British Officer. Behind the British Victory in North Africa. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
- A. J. GRAYDANZEV. India's Wartime Finances. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
- ALBERT E. KANE. The Development of Indian Politics. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Mar.
- SIR GEORGE SANSOM. The Story of Singapore. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
- A. G. L. SHAW. The Australian Coal Industry. 1929-39. *Ec. Record*, June.
- KENNETH B. CUMBERLAND. Contrasting Regional Morphology of Soil Erosion in New Zealand. *Geograph. Rev.*, Jan.
- H. L. WISE. Price Stabilization in New Zealand. *Ec. Record*, June.
- DAVID LEWIS. Socialism across the Border—Canada's C.C.F. *Antioch Rev.*, Winter.
- AILEEN D. ROSS. The Cultural Effects of Population Changes in the Eastern Townships. *Can. Jour. Ec. Pol. Sci.*, Nov.
- J. W. WATSON. Urban Developments in the Niagara Peninsula. *Ibid.*
- F. C. CRONKITE. The Judicial Committee and the Farm Debt Problem. *Ibid.*
- Writings on Irish History, 1941; with Addenda, 1940. *Irish Hist. Stud.*, Mar.
- L. A. SKEOCH. Changes in Canadian Wheat Policy. *Can. Jour. Ec. Pol. Sci.*, Nov.
- F. W. GRAY. Canada and Coal. *Queen's Quar.*, Autumn.
- J. J. L. MORISON. Canadian Diplomacy in American Affairs. *History*, Sept.
- FRANÇOIS-ALBERT ANGERS. Vues Canadiennes-françaises sur le problème canadien. *Culture*, Dec.
- EATON MAXWELL. Canada Looks to the Postwar. *Antioch Rev.*, Winter.
- L. DUDLEY STAMP. Britain Looks to the Land. *For. Affairs*, Jan.

DOCUMENTS

- L. E. WHATMORE. The Sermon against the Holy Maid of Kent and Her Adherents, Delivered at Paul's Cross and Canterbury, 1533. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
- MAURA CARNEY. Agreement between O'Domhnaill and Tadhg O'Conchobhair Concerning Sligo Castle (23 June, 1539). *Irish Hist. Stud.*, Mar.
- GODFREY DAVIES. The By-Election at Grantham, 1678. *Huntington Library Quar.*, Feb.
- JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT. Selkirk's Views on British Policy toward the Spanish-American Colonies, 1806. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- D. C. HARVEY. A Blue Print for Nova Scotia in 1818. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- W. SHERWOOD FOX. A Voice from the 'Fifties: Excerpts from the Letters of William Davies. *Queen's Quar.*, Autumn.
- The Diary of Robert Melrose: Part III, 1856-57. *Brit. Col. Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- A. GROVE DAY. James Smithson in Durance. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

FRANCE

AUTOUR DE L'EXPÉDITION DE SAINT-DOMINGUE: LES ESPOIRS D'UNE FAMILLE D'ANCIENS PLANTEURS (1801-1804). By G. Debien. [Notes d'histoire coloniale—III.] (Extract from the *Revue de la Société d'Histoire et de Géographie d'Haiti*, October, 1942, pp. 1-95.) During the period of the French Revolution and Napoleon, the Bourbons were not the only ones who looked fondly back to the days

before 1789 when they had things their way and all was right with the world. The St. Domingue planters shared such sentiments. No group in France, unless it was the shippers and merchants in the port towns, greeted the Peace of Amiens with more unalloyed joy. At last the way seemed clear to reduce the insurgent Negroes of St. Domingue to their former subjection. In this publication M. Debien has printed fifty-six letters which depict the hopes, fears, and disappointments of the Vanssay family in the course of the Leclerc expedition. More than half of the letters were written by Armand de Vanssay to his mother, the Marquise de Vanssay, and to his brother Achilles. Armand, aged nineteen, went out to the colony in July, 1802. His purpose was twofold: first, to advance his military career in what appeared then to be a brilliant campaign, and, secondly, to look after the family's plantation interests. The first purpose was realized in a measure. General Rochambeau treated Armand like his own son, and he rose from the rank of sergeant to underlieutenant. Otherwise Armand experienced nothing but misfortune—he was terribly ill for a time with yellow fever, the stiff opposition of the blacks made it impossible for him to set plantation operations in motion, and he returned to France in October, 1803, so destitute that he was obliged to write to his mother for funds. These events are recounted artlessly in letters of singular charm. As M. Debien says, the letters contain no important revelations but they do afford an opportunity to view the Leclerc expedition through the fresh eyes of an appealing young soldier of fortune.

C. L. LOKKE

ARTICLES

GEORGE WEIS. The Restitution of the Huguenots' Property at the French Revolution. *Proc. Huguenot Soc.* (London), XVII, 2.

LOUIS GOTTSCHALK. The French Parlements and Judicial Review. *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, Jan.

SHEPARD B. CLOUGH. The House That Pétain Built. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Mar.

NORTHERN EUROPE

O. J. Falnes

BONDEN I SVENSK HISTORIA. By *E. Ingers*. (Stockholm, Landbruksförbundets tidskrifts A/B., 1943.) A survey of the Swedish farmer as a member of society through the centuries.

SVERIGES UTRIKESPOLITIK UNDER KRIGSÅREN 1675-1679. By *Ragnar Hoffstedt*. (Stockholm, 1943, kr. 10.) Sweden at the congress of Nijmegen.

ARTILLERIET UNDER KARL XII'S-TIDEN. By *Theodor Jacobsson*. (Stockholm, Generalstabens litografiska anstalts förlag, 1943.)

HANDELSSTEDER I FINNMARK. By *N. A. Ytreberg*. (Trondheim, F. Bruns Bokhandels forlag, 1943, Sw. kr. 14.25.)

RIKSRÅDENS LICENTIERING. By *Lennart Linnarson*. (Uppsala, Statsvetenskapliga Föreningen, 1943.) A study of parliamentarianism of the period of independence.

DANMARK OG SLAVEHANDELEN [I Anledning af 150-Aaret for Forordninger om Negerhandelens Ophævelse]. By *Niels E. Sylvest*. (Copenhagen, 1942.)

INDUSTRIENS HISTORIE I DANMARK. By *Axel Nielsen*. Vol. I, to 1820. (Copenhagen, 1943.)

NY SVENSK HISTORIA. By *Erik Lindorm*. Three volumes. (Stockholm[?], 1938-42, kr. 220.) Covers the period of Carl XIV, Johan-Carl XV, Oscar II, and Gustaf V.

SVENSK FOLKHÖGSKOLA UNDER 75 ÅR. Edited by *Karl Hedlund*. (Stockholm, Hökerbergs bokförlag, 1943, Sw. kr. 17.50.)

DE STORE FØLELSERS TID. By *Ragnar Vold*. (Oslo, Aschehoug, 1943, Sw. kr. 11.75.) Some national currents in the years 1879-80.

FREDERIK VIII, 1843-1912. By *P. Munch*. (Copenhagen, 1943.)

BARONER, BÖNDER OCH BOLSJEVIKER I ESTLAND. By *Carl Mothander*. (Stockholm, Hökerbergs bokförlag, 1943, Sw. kr. 10.) The Baltic barons and Estonian farmers during the years of independence and the ensuing Soviet penetration and occupation of 1939-41.

IN I DET SISTA (Swedish translation). By *Olavi Siipainen*. (*Ibid.*, 1943, Sw. kr. 7.50.) A book about Finland's winter war.

NORGES TREDJE KRIGSÅR. By *W. Brandt*. (Stockholm, Bonniers, 1943, kr. 7.50.)

FRA 9 APRIL TIL 17 MAI. By *Hans Jacob Ustvedt*. (Stockholm, Bonniers, 1943, Sw. kr. 1.50.) A discussion of Nordic problems with special stress on postwar economic questions.

DANMARK I KAMP [Swedish translation from Danish]. By *Morten Pihl*. (Stockholm[?], Jonson and Winter, 1943, Sw. kr. 1.75.) Survey of the events of August 29, 1943, and their background.

STORMAGTSPOLITIK OG EUROPAS SMAA STATER. By *Einard Skov*. (Copenhagen, 1943.)

ARTICLES

SIGRID UNDSET. Fredrik Paasche: In Memoriam. *Am. Scand. Rev.*, Dec.

MARGARET SCHLAUGH. The Women of the Icelandic Sagas. *Ibid.*

Social Planning in Sweden. *Internat. Labour Rev.*, Sept.

K. KOCK. Swedish Economic Policy during the War. *Rev. Ec. Stud.*, X, no. 2 (1943).

JOACHIM JOESTEN. Denmark's Costly Revolt. *Virginia Quar. Rev.*, Winter.

GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND HUNGARY

Ernst Posner

THE DANUBE BASIN AND THE GERMAN ECONOMIC SPHERE. By *Antonin Basch*. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. 293, \$3.50.) "The problems of Danubian economy, especially since 1931, in relation to Germany. By a Czech economist, now a member of the economics department of Columbia University."

ARTICLES

H. S. BLUHM. Recent American Research on Luther's German Bible. *Germanic Rev.*, Oct.

MAX NEUBURGER. British Medicine and the Göttingen Medical School in the Eighteenth Century. *Bull. Hist. Medicine*, Nov.

WERNER RICHTER. Deutscher Geist und französische Literatur im Lichte der Säkularisierung. *Monatsh. f. Deutschen Unterricht*, Oct.

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. The Politics of Hegel. *Dublin Rev.*, Oct.

SOLOMON F. BLOOM. Man of His Century: A Reconsideration of the Historical Significance of Karl Marx. *Jour. Pol. Ec.*, Dec.

KARL J. R. ARNDT. Sealsfield's Early Reception in England and America. *Germanic Rev.*, Oct.

VEIT VALENTIN. Bismarck and Lasker. *Jour. Central Europ. Affairs*, Jan.

LOUIS I. DUBLIN. Robert Koch: A Centenary, 1843-1943. *Am. Scholar*, Winter.

- The Economic Impact of Imperial Germany. *Tasks Ec. Hist.*, Dec.
 HANS ROSENBERG. Agricultural Policy.
 ROBERT A. BRADY. Industrial Policy.
 MARY E. TOWNSEND. Commercial and Colonial Policies.
 GEORGE BOAS. The Occupation of Enemy Territory: Human Relations in Military Government [Rhineland, 1918-19]. *Public Opinion Quar.*, Winter.
 HERBERT ROSINSKI. Rebuilding the Reichswehr. *Atlantic Monthly*, Feb.
 BERNARD D. WEINRYB. Nazification of Science and Research in Nazi Germany. *Jour. Central Europ. Affairs*, Jan.
 HAROLD VON HOFE. German Literature in Exile. *Ger. Quar.*, Jan.
 J. L. BROWN. Deutschtum and Amerika. *Jour. Legal and Pol. Sociol.*, Oct.
 ALBERT CARR. The Five Fatal Mistakes of the Axis. *Harper's*, Feb.
 Conditions in the Baltic Republics and White Russia under German Occupation: Economic and Labour Measures in 1941-1942. *Internat. Labour Rev.*, Feb.
 DOROTHY THOMPSON. Signals from Germany. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
 H. A. DEWEERD. Germany's Strategic Position. *Yale Rev.*, Winter.
 ALBERT GUÉRARD. Germany and a New Europe. *Antioch Rev.*, Winter.
 ALFRED KANTOROWICZ. "Free Germany" in Moscow, a Weapon of Psychological Warfare. *Free World*, Feb.
 KURT LEWIN. The Occupation of Enemy Territory: The Special Case of Germany. *Public Opinion Quar.*, Winter.
 GREGOR ZIEMER. The Occupation of Enemy Territory: Rehabilitating Fascist Youth. *Ibid.*
 AUREL KOLNAI. Danubia: A Survey of Plans of Solution. *Jour. Central Europ. Affairs*, Jan.
 S. H. THOMSON. Recent Pamphlet Literature on Central Europe. *Ibid.*, Oct. and Jan.
 JOSEPH S. ROUCEK. The Sociological Weaknesses of Federation Plans for Eastern Europe. *Jour. Legal and Pol. Sociol.*, Oct.
 WERNER NÄF. Europäische Schweiz. *Schweiz. Hochschulzeitung*, July.

ITALY

Gaudens Megaro

ARTICLES

- ANGELINE H. LOGRASSO. Due lettere inedite di Silvio Pellico. *Italiana*, Sept.
Id. Poe's Piero Maroncelli. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, Sept.
 WALTER TOSCANINI. La leggenda di una Casa Savoia liberale. *Italia Libera*, Feb. 1.
 JAMES MURPHY. The Italian Monarchy. *Nineteenth Century*, Jan.
Id. The Problem of Power in Italy. *Ibid.*, Nov.
 R. P. DUTT. Fall of Mussolini. *Labour Monthly*, Sept.
 BENEDETTO CROCE. The Fascist Germ Still Lives. *New York Times Mag.*, Nov. 28.
 ENZO TAGLIACOZZO. What Croce Means to Italian Youth. *Countercurrent*, Jan.
 LUIGI STURZO. The Roman Question before and after Fascism. *Rev. Pol.*, Oct.
Id. Christian Democracy in Italy. *Commonweal*, Jan. 28.
Id. The Church and Democracy and Salvemini—La Piana. *America*, Nov. 6.
Id. The Vatican and Fascism, as Seen by Salvemini and La Piana. *Commonweal*, Dec. 17.
 GEORGE LA PIANA and GAETANO SALVEMINI. An Answer to Don Sturzo. *Countercurrent*, Feb.
 HARRY H. FLANNERY. Salvemini, the Catholic Church, and Fascism. *Free World*, Jan.
 G. SALVEMINI. Bishops, Archbishops, Cardinals, Popes, and Fascism. *Ibid.*, Mar.
Id. Program for Italy. *New Repub.*, Nov. 15.
Id. King's Men. *Nation*, Nov. 27.
Id. Freedom of Worship in Italy. *Ibid.*, Dec. 11.
Id. From Moscow to Naples. *New Repub.*, Dec. 27; *Countercurrent*, Dec.
Id. Liberated Italy. *Nation*, Jan. 1.
Id. Italian War Prisoners. *New Repub.*, Jan. 10.
 ROBERT SENCOURT. How Mussolini Beguiled Italy. *Contemp. Rev.*, Oct.
 DAVID JONA. Fascist Propaganda. *Countercurrent*, Feb.

- AURELIO NATOLI. I "grandi," i "piccoli" e la reggenza: Documenti per la storia di domani. *Mondo*, Dec.
Id. L'astratto e il concreto: Documenti per la storia di domani. *Ibid.*, Feb.
 Carlo a Prato. Problemi italiani vissuti da italiani in Europa [cont.]. *Ibid.*, Dec.
 KENNETH A. JOHNSON. Anglo-American Diplomacy in Italy. *Italia Libera*, Feb. 1.
 LUIGI STURZO. Rennel of Rodd e la Sicilia. *Mondo*, Dec.
 RANDOLFO PACCARDI. Not Even a Dish Cloth [concerning Churchill and Italy]. *Italia Libera*, Mar. 1.
 GIOVANNI VILLANI. The Bombardment of Montecassino. *Ibid.*
 MARCELLO MAESTRO. Louis Adamic and the Italians. *Mondo*, Dec.
 IVOR THOMAS. The Future of Italy. *Contemp. Rev.*, Nov.
 MARIO EINAUDI. The Economic Reconstruction of Italy. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
 EDWARD D. KLEINLERER. Future of Italy's Colonies. *New Europe*, Jan.
 J. SCOFIELD. Italian Weapons. *Infantry Jour.*, Oct.

RUSSIA AND POLAND

Avrahm Yarmolinsky

ARTICLES

- A. MISHULIN. O voennom iskusstve skifov [Scythian military art]. *Istoricheski zhurnal*, nos. 8/9 (1943).
 P. SMIRNOV. Posadskie lyudi i ikh klassovaya bor'ba do serediny XVII veka [townspeople and their class struggle until the middle of the seventeenth century]. *Ibid.*
 O. J. FREDERIKSEN. Alexander I and His League to End Wars. *Russian Rev.*, Autumn.
 Z. EGGERT. Otnemena rabstva v S.Sh.A. i otkliki v Rossii [the abolition of slavery in U.S.A. and echoes of it in Russia]. *Istoricheski zhurnal*, nos. 8/9 (1943).
 OSCAR HALECKI. Polish-Russian Relations—Past and Present. *Rev. Pol.*, no. 5 (1943).
 VLADIMIR P. TIMOSHENKO. The Agrarian Policies of Russia and the Wars. *Agricultural Hist.*, Oct.

Far Eastern History

E. H. Pritchard

THE LAND OF THE GREAT IMAGE: BEING EXPERIENCES OF FRIAR MANRIQUE IN ARAKAN. By *Maurice Collis*. (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1943, pp. ix, 266, v, \$3.00.) It is exceedingly difficult to define this extraordinary book in general terms. One can say that the author deals with the experiences of the Jesuit Friar Sebastiao Manrique in India and Arakan, "The Land of the Great Image," between the years 1628 and 1636. The book may also be described as a magnificent painting of society in Portuguese India and in some of those kingdoms with which the viceroys of Goa had dealings; it is a kind of historical-philosophical Baedeker of seventeenth century India. What Mr. Collis has really done is to give us one of the most illuminating treatises on the architecture and fabric of the Baroque mind, that boundless and tireless will to expansion that sent the Portuguese adventurers to cast a necklace of trading posts and forts around the shores of India, that yearning for universal spiritual sovereignty that exemplified the labors of the Jesuit fathers. This will to universal rule, temporal and spiritual, may be seen, too, in the account of King Thiri-thu-dhamma, who, in his aspiration to revive the ancient Indian concept of the Cakravartin or world ruler, led him to delve into the practice of necromancy. Although Manrique was a dogmatic theologian, never guilty of the sin of tolerance for pagan religions, it must be admitted that he had considerable powers of observation.

Mr. Collis' interpretation of the traveler's encounters with the Indian religions presents one of the clearest and most concise accounts of Buddhism and Brahmanism in this period. Indeed, the author's explanation of some of the more abstruse concepts of Buddhist metaphysic have seldom been equaled. There are many such irrelevant passages in the book and they are among the most interesting chapters: Manrique during his visit to Arakan noted the presence of Japanese, Samurai guardsmen, in that very patch of ground which Lord Mountbatten now strives to gain from their descendants. The only passage in the book which seems not only irrelevant but definitely weak is the author's conclusion that America, by the eventual defeat of Japan, will become the heir of Goa as a savior and creator of a universal state for Asian millions!

BENJAMIN ROWLAND, JR.

BRITISH FAR EASTERN POLICY. By *Gilbert Ernest Hubbard*. [I. P. R. Inquiry Series.] (New York, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943, pp. 104, \$1.25.)

ARTICLES

- K. M. BEAUMONT. Air Transport in the Pacific: A British View. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
 TUAN-SHENG CHIEN. How to Deal with Japan after Victory. *China at War*, Dec.
 C. Y. HSU. In the Wake of Japanese Retreat: An Account of Enemy Atrocities in Hupeh and Hunan. *Ibid.*, Sept.
 HARRY MACNAMARA. Australia and the United Nations. *Amerasia*, Oct. 25.
 FRANK ROSS MCCOY. Our Relations with the Far East. *For. Policy Reports*, Oct. 15.
 MANUEL SEOANE. The Japanese Are Still in Peru. *Asia*, Dec.
 WALTER T. SWINGLE. Trees and Plants We Owe to Asia. *Ibid.*, Nov.
 ROSWELL S. BRITTON. A Question of Early Shang. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, Oct.-Dec.
 PAO-CHUAN CHAO. Needed Changes in China's Rural System. *China at War*, Sept.
 CHIH-MAI CHEN. China's Constitutional Movement. *Ibid.*, Oct.
Id. Progress of Political Reform in Wartime China. *Quar. Bull. Chinese Bibliog.*, Mar.-June, 1943.
 YÜAN CHEN. Post-war Foreign Policy. *For. Policy Reports*, Nov. 1.
 TUAN-SHENG CHIEN. Wartime Local Government in China. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
 S. R. CHOW. China's Road toward Democracy. *Free World*, Nov.
 ALEXANDRA DAVID-NEEL. Mohammedans of the Chinese Far West. *Asia*, Dec.
 JOHN DE FRANCIS. The Alphabetization of Chinese. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, Oct.-Dec.
 Economic. Japanese Economic Exploitation of Occupied China [and] Japan in Manchuria. *China at War*, Sept.
 SIDNEY D. GAMBLE. Daily Wages of Unskilled Chinese Laborers, 1807-1902. *Far Eastern Quar.*, Nov.
 L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH and SHOU-HSÜAN HAN. The *Ming Shih-lu*. *Ibid.*
 L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH. Cotton in China. *Isis*, Summer.
 DAVID CROCKETT GRAHAM. The Customs of the Ch'iang. *Jour. West China Border Research Soc.*, 1942.
 TSAI-YU HSIAO. A Project for Reestablishing Libraries in China after the War. *China Inst. Bull.*, Sept.-Oct.
 Y. Y. HSU. Sidelights on China's Wartime Production. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
Id. The Pao-chia System in China. *Far Eastern Survey*, Dec. 8.
 WILLIAM C. JOHNSTONE. Japan's "New" China Policy. *Ibid.*, Sept. 22.
 YU-CHUAN KU. A Pattern for Industrialization. *China at War*, Oct.
 MO-JO KUO. A Poet with the Northern Expedition. Translated by Josiah W. Bennett. *Far Eastern Quar.*, Nov.
 CHI-TING KWEI. Science, Education, and China's Reconstruction. *Sci. Monthly*, Nov.
 KENNETH S. LATOURETTE. Samuel Wells Williams [1812-84]. *Notes on Far Eastern Stud. in Am.*, Spring, 1943.
 CHOH-MING LI. China in World Economy. *For. Policy Reports*, Nov. 1.
 YU-YING LI. Where Is China Going? *Free World*, Oct.

- N. C. LIU. China's Political Development. *Far Eastern Survey*, Oct. 6.
 C. Y. W. MENG. Foreign Enterprise in Postwar China. *Ibid.*, Nov. 3.
 GUENTHER STEIN. Overseas Chinese Look Ahead. *Far Eastern Survey*, Nov. 17.
Id. China's Internal Transport System. *Ibid.*, Oct. 20.
 KOJIRO TOMITA. A Chinese Sacrificial Stone House of the Sixth Century A. D. *Bull. Boston Museum of Fine Arts*, no. 242.
 WEN-HAO WONG. China's Industry—Past and Present. *China at War*, Oct.
 CHING-CHAO WU. Internal Economic Development. *For. Policy Reports*, Nov. 1.
Id. Industrial Areas in Post-war China. *China at War*, Oct.
 CH'I-SUN YEH. Work of Academia Sinica, 1937-42. *Quar. Bull. Chinese Bibliog.*, Mar.-June, 1943.
 WALDEMAR GURIAN. The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia. *Rev. Pol.*, Apr., 1943.
 A. N. POLIAK. The Influence of Chingiz-Khân's Yâsa upon the General Organization of the Mamluk State. *Bull. School Oriental Stud.*, X, 862-76.
 ALLAN B. COLE. Japan's Population Problems in War and Peace. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
 E. HERBERT NORMAN. Militarists in the Japanese State. *Ibid.*
 FO SUN. The Mikado Must Go. *China at War*, Dec.
 WILFRID BENSON. Labor Problems in Southeast Asia. *Pacific Affairs*, Dec.
 J. O. M. BROEK. The Future of Southeast Asia. *Far Eastern Survey*, Dec. 22.
 GILBERT CANT. Oceania: What to Do about It. *Asia*, Dec.
 G. COEDÈS. Études cambodgiennes, XXXIII. La destination funéraire des grands monuments Khmers. *Bull. école française d'Extreme-Orient*, XL.
 R. DALET. Notes sur un linteau de P'imai. *Ibid.*
Id. Un nouveau cimetière Cam à Thô'i-an. *Ibid.*
 MAURICE GLAIZE. Essai sur la connaissance de Naũk Pãn après Anastylose. *Ibid.*
Id. Le gopura de Práh Pàilai. *Ibid.*
Id. Le degagement du Phnom Kròm. *Ibid.*
 VICTOR GOLOUBEV. Le Tambour Métallique de Hoàng-Ha. *Ibid.*
 DORA GORDINE. A Lecture on the Sculpture of Indochina, Siam, and Java. *Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc.* (1942), pp. 132-38.
 C. HARTLEY GRATTAN. Confederation or Conglomeration [Oceania]. *Asia*, Dec.
 PAUL LÉVY. Les traces de l'introduction du Bouddhisme à Luang Prabang. *Bull. école française d'Extreme-Orient*, XL.
 SELDEN C. MENEFFEE. Thailand in Bondage. *Asia*, Nov.
 K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI. Sri Vijaya. *Bull. école française d'Extreme-Orient*, XL.
 M. R. SENI PRAMOJ. Thailand and Japan. *Far Eastern Survey*, Oct. 20.
 LAWRENCE K. ROSINGER. Independence for Colonial Asia—the Cost to the Western World. *For. Policy Reports*, Feb. 1.
 ROBERT SHAFER. Further Analysis of the Pyu Inscriptions. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, Sept.
 R. O. WINSTEDT. Nature in Malay Literature and Folk Verse. *Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc.* (1943), pp. 27-33.
 On the Chinese Communist Party: Kuomintang C. E. C. Manifesto. *China at War*, Oct.
 The Moscow Declaration: The Cairo Communiqué. *Ibid.*, Dec.

United States History

E. C. Burnett

GENERAL

THE PLANTING OF THE SWEDISH CHURCH IN AMERICA: GRADUATION DISSERTATION OF TOBIAS ERIC BIÖRK. Translated and edited by *Ira Oliver Nothstein*. [Augustana Library Publications, Number 19, William Baehr, General Editor.] (Rock Island, Augustana College Library, 1943, pp. 39.) Dr. Nothstein has

performed a real service in translating and annotating this little treatise, written in 1731, of which only two Latin copies are known to exist in the United States. The author of this Uppsala dissertation was a native of America, the son of a pastor who played a prominent role in the revival of Swedish Lutheranism along the Delaware about the year 1700 and in the building of the Old Swedes' churches in Wilmington and Philadelphia which are still in use. He writes as a theologian rather than as a historian, and his opus is fragmentary and not well organized. Nevertheless, the student of life in the middle colonies may find something of interest here, particularly in regard to the religious situation, including the religious attitude of the Indians and the close co-operation between the Swedish and Anglican churches. CONRAD PETERSON

ORIGINS OF AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY: THE SOCIAL SCIENCE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. By *L. L. Bernard*, Washington University, and *Jessie Bernard*, Lindenwood College. (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell, 1943, pp. xiv, 866, \$6.50.) To express adequate appreciation of this work would far exceed space limits allotted to its review. It represents enormous outlays of time, energy, and resourcefulness in searching out materials both American and European to produce what is virtually a genealogy of American sociology. There is nothing comparable to it in extent or detail as a contribution to the "history of ideas." Bury's essay on the idea of progress appears extremely limited when measured against this Cyclopean structure. This volume should prove of value and interest to any and all of the separated branches of social science, and particularly to historians (notably part II, on the historical method and social science), since the content and method of the work are predominantly historical. This is not "historical sociology"—if there be such a thing—but a history of sociology and incidentally of its sister disciplines. Its avowed purpose is to give an account of the "Social Science Movement" as the "most direct and immediate predecessor of the academic discipline sociology"; hence it traces the phases through which early social philosophy, Comtean influence, utopian social reconstruction, various types of social reform, and collegiate teaching passed and by synthesis and later division produced a fairly distinguishable entity. The movement began as an effort to improve the condition of mankind by social reconstruction and ended in the twofold purpose of seeking to set up a theory of social organization and evolution as a guide to human betterment and implementing that theory by concrete social legislation and corrective agencies. The authors put this all into a single eloquent sentence: "A very noble impatience with social and economic injustice, and an earnest determination to do something about it—that was Social Science." Vast as the dimensions of this work are, it does not profess to tell the whole story, for by design it omits many of the philosophical strands woven into all the social sciences. Comte is the only philosopher rated as supremely significant in this story, and nearly a quarter of the book is devoted to his influence. One might quarrel with the authors over the relatively large space devoted to such men as Brisbane or Masquerier by contrast with the small area given to Sumner. "Sumnerologists" will probably writhe over the dictum that their hero almost totally lacked originality and genius and that for compensation "he was one of the best examples of the doctrine of meticulous thoroughness and industry which he preached." Some readers may attribute to the authors undue anti-religious bias; but if any it is probably antitheological and derived from the very nature of their story. Not the least service of the work is to reveal how most of current theories, concepts, and procedures were clearly anticipated seventy years ago. Moreover, the work is timely, because it makes almost startlingly evident that the immediate scientific precursors and forebears of sociology were in the direct line of that present view of life which is in conflict with totalitarianism and domination by brute force.

ARTHUR J. TODD

THE PATRIOTISM OF JOSEPH REED. By *Ellsworth Eliot, jr.* [Yale University Library Miscellanies, III.] (New Haven, Yale University Library, 1943, pp. 42.) Joseph Reed's correspondence with Lord Dartmouth, secretary for the colonies, his wife's English family connections, an unfortunate letter to General Charles Lee, whose answer came inadvertently to General Washington's attention, and the suspicion against him voiced by Arthur Lee have long since raised the question whether Colonel Reed's patriotism was entirely dependable. Mr. Eliot here presents new evidence and reviews that already known. His volume opens with an undated order from General Howe's headquarters not to molest nor injure Joseph Reed in his person or property, endorsed in a different hand on the back, "Joseph Reed sworn Feby. 21st, 1777," a document gravely deepening the doubt as to his patriotism. With this incriminating evidence there is a condensed biographical sketch, just enough to let the reader make the acquaintance of Colonel Reed. Mr. Eliot's presentation of information gleaned from Reed's correspondence to show how the doubt of his patriotism arose reveals painstaking research, bringing in Reed's delegation by Washington to receive General Howe's representatives in 1776 and a review of the letters and publications accusing and defending Reed's integrity. To one not familiar with the details of the history of the time, the review of Reed's correspondence is somewhat confusing. For example, more than one Lee figures in Reed's life, and the distinction is not always clear between the diplomat who wrote letters about Reed and the general who wrote letters to him. The account of the pamphlet polemics is excellent. The study is obviously preliminary, and the author is not convinced by the new evidence of Reed's duplicity. General Howe's order is not unique. The reviewer recently saw a similar order, for the protection of one John Hutchinson, signed by John Montrossor, one of Howe's aides. The Howe order may have been some sort of safe-conduct given to Reed for his negotiation in 1776. The endorsement of February 21, 1777, will probably prove a more stubborn enigma. The pamphlet is attractively bound and beautifully printed. The frontispiece is an excellent reproduction of James Peale's miniature portrait of Reed. The thorough bibliography includes newspapers and books cited which deal with the main argument of the book.

CHARLES C. SAVAGE, JR.

THE CASE OF A. L——, AGED FIFTY-SIX: SOME CURIOUS MEDICAL ASPECTS OF LINCOLN'S DEATH AND OTHER STUDIES. By *Otto Eisenschiml.* (Chicago, Abraham Lincoln Bookshop, 1943, pp. 52, \$3.50.)

THE UNITED STATES 1865-1900: A SURVEY OF CURRENT LITERATURE WITH ABSTRACTS OF UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS. Edited by *Curtis Wiswell Garrison.* Volume I, SEPTEMBER, 1941-AUGUST, 1942. (Fremont, Ohio, the Rutherford B. Hayes-Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation, 1943, pp. ix, 177.) This little volume is the first of a series in which the promoters plan an annual issue. The present one covers only books and articles published within the twelve months ending August 31, 1942, and dealing with the years 1865-1900. These date limits mark the active years of Rutherford B. Hayes and Mrs. Hayes, and the Hayes Foundation seeks through this publication to aid citizens in general "to understand the period in which they lived and moved." The project is no mere neighborhood undertaking. The editorial board includes prominent historians throughout the country, and the fifty-three contributors are even more widely distributed. The survey brings under observation works on religion, literature, art, and intellectual movements as well as economic, political, and historical studies. The total number of titles covered is 203, besides data relating to fifty-six doctoral dissertations accepted by various universities during 1942. To distinguish these "critiques" from the usual type of review, the guide for the con-

tributor, in effect, is the question "Do we learn anything new?" In future issues it is planned to summarize each group of contributions with the purpose of enabling the intelligent layman to "understand what this body of writing is doing for society." The present volume gives promise that, guided by the light of experience, the venture will be carried forward with increasing usefulness.

HOMER C. HOCKETT

HARRIET TUBMAN. By *Earl Conrad*. (Washington, Associated Publishers, 1943, pp. xiv, 248, \$3.25.) Earl Conrad, author of this first full-length biography of the woman "black as paint" who was an American heroine of yesterday and is still one of the idols of today as the "Moses of her people," claims that "the white publishers would not issue" the book "because this is of the people that the white rulers are slow to free." Naturally his concept of freedom transcends legal emancipation. Nevertheless, his story of Harriet Tubman, a woman born a slave in Maryland "probably" in 1820, is not broken by his indulgence in his own homilies. He recites the odyssey of one who was never a slave by nature in a straight, flowing, and careful account of her perilous exploits, from the time when she conducted from two to three hundred slaves out of servitude along the underground railway to liberty without "losing a soul," through the years of the Civil War during which she was a scout, a spy, a nurse, and a strategist working with federal officers in South Carolina, amid the abolition and suffrage movements, on to her matriarchal care of the ex-slaves, ending with the military honors accorded her at her death in Auburn, New York, in 1913. He acknowledges the assistance and friendship she won from powerful white folk. His story is heavily documented. He names "men and women from all walks of life, Negro and white," who helped him to assemble his materials. Why then should white publishers refuse to print his story of the Negro heroine? The claim is difficult to accept. Can it be that the last sentence establishes it? It poses the question: "How many of the white race exist today who will ever merit equal recognition with Harriet Tubman?" But this question is a quotation from the editorial in the Auburn *Citizen* published the day after her burial. In terms either of quantity or quality that question may be unanswerable. Perhaps no living member of her own race will ever merit equal recognition from men and women who study the judgment passed on her in 1868 by another great Negro, Frederick Douglass, and included in this biography.

MARY R. BEARD

THOSE WERE THE DAYS: TALES OF A LONG LIFE. By *Edward Ringwood Hewitt*. (New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1943, pp. 332, \$3.00.)

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS ACCEPTED BY AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES, 1942-1943. Edited by *Edward Atwood Henry*. (New York, H. W. Wilson, 1943, pp. 123, \$2.50.)

YORKTOWN: CLIMAX OF THE REVOLUTION. Edited by *Charles E. Hatch, jr.*, and *Thomas M. Pitkin*. [National Park Service, Source Book Series, Number 1.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1941, pp. vi, 26, 15 cents.) "This book is an attempt to portray the crowning campaign of the American Revolution in the language of participants." There are six illustrations.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN FROM HIS OWN WORDS AND CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNTS. Edited by *Roy Edgar Appleman*. [National Park Service, Source Book Series, Number 2.] (*Ibid.*, 1942, pp. viii, 55, 20 cents.) "It is the purpose of this book to bring together a few of the more important and significant passages of Lincoln's letters, speeches, and state documents, together with firsthand observations and appraisals of the man by some of those who saw him with contemporary eyes." There are twenty-four illustrations, "themselves contemporary historical documents."

THE BUILDING OF CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS. By *Albert C. Manucy*, Assistant Historical Technician, Castillo de San Marcos National Monument. [National Park Service, Interpretive Series, History No. 1.] (*Ibid.*, 1942, pp. ii, 34, 10 cents.) While this study is primarily concerned with giving a historical and descriptive account of the actual building of the Castillo de San Marcos at St. Augustine, the events of a century that led to the building of the castillo are comprehensively related. There are ten illustrations.

THE OLDEST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY IN AMERICA AND ITS FIRST STATE-HOUSE. By *Charles E. Hatch, jr.*, Junior Historical Technician, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia. [National Park Service, Popular Study Series, History No. 15.] (*Ibid.*, 1943, pp. ii, 30, 10 cents.) The oldest legislative assembly in America was of course that assembled at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1619. The historical setting in which the assembly was called is here set forth, together with an account of the acquisition of a statehouse in 1641. The remainder of the essay is concerned with the recent excavation of the foundations of the building and with an examination of its architectural structure. There are nine illustrations.

Prompted by a suggestion made by the committee on government publications in its report last April, that "government documents receive much less notice in periodicals than they merit," and that "more frequent reviews of them" in historical magazines might well be encouraged, the Department of Interior has sent to the *Review* the four publications of the National Park Service mentioned above, which have been published during the past three years. Probably no more than a fraction of the members of the American Historical Association have been cognizant of the fact that the National Park Service has undertaken to bring out historical studies of a substantial character. In transmitting these items Mr. Herbert Kahler writes: "While these publications have been written primarily for the layman visiting the historical areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, they are based, for the most part, on primary source materials, and, in the case of *The Oldest Legislative Assembly in America and Its First State House*, on archaeological evidence supplementing the written record." How it comes about that a study of Abraham Lincoln comes within the purview of the National Park Service is not entirely clear.

EDWARD DOUGLAS WHITE, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES. By Sister *Marie Carolyn Klinkhamer*, O. P., of the Sisters of Saint Dominic, Congregation of the Most Holy Rosary, Adrian, Michigan. (Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1943, pp. viii, 308.) The author of this doctoral thesis has succeeded admirably in her purpose to examine White's "life and his own opinions in the light of their relation to the legal and constitutional history of the period in which he lived." The work is scholarly, compact, well documented. While sympathetic and appreciative it is refreshingly free from unsupported generalizations, is carefully restrained in tone, and makes no attempt at adulation or an undue magnification of White's importance. White's family background, school studies, and his experience in civil law, politics, the legislature and supreme court of Louisiana, and as United States senator are succinctly stated, as well as the circumstances leading to his appointment by Cleveland as an associate justice of the Supreme Court. Then follow chapters on his contributions to administrative law, procedure, jurisdiction and international law, property, and due process. The author has painstakingly analyzed the nearly six hundred cases in which White participated while associate justice, plus those while chief justice, with a view to ascertaining his "method of attack, his formulation of decisions and his stylistic peculiarities." This purpose has been well achieved notwithstanding the great quantity of White's judicial output, the wide variety and the

complexity of legal questions considered, his detailed statement of fact and pages of history and precedent and, above all, a repellant, antithetical, and obscure style encumbered with involved periodic sentences, prolixity, and repetition. That the author has been able to follow White's reasoning, pierce through to the principles upon which his opinions were based, state them clearly, and appraise them judicially is a manifestation of industry, skill, and insight. Particularly to be commended is the author's failure to succumb to the common temptation to consider too exclusively constitutional cases and her portrayal of White's important and pioneer contributions to the development of administrative law.

BEN W. PALMER

THE LIFE OF ALBERT GALLATIN. By *Henry Adams*. Reprinted under the auspices of the Out-of-Print Books Committee of the American Library Association. (New York, Peter Smith, 1943, pp. v, 697, \$7.50.) Librarians and scholars who have sought in vain to acquire this volume, first printed in 1879 and long out of print and unobtainable at any price, will welcome this reprint. Henry Adams wrote it at the time he was editing Gallatin's Papers. It is still standard, if not definitive, and indispensable to the special student of the man, the period, or public finance.

A SHORT HISTORY OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY. By *Roy F. Nichols*, Professor of History, University of Pennsylvania, and *Jeannette P. Nichols*, Sometime Professor of History, Wesleyan College. [The Century Historical Series, William E. Lingelbach, Editor.] (New York, D. Appleton-Century, 1943, pp. xvii, 626, lxx, \$4.00.) "Teaching needs occasionally call for somewhat shorter textbooks, in which the history of American democracy is closely integrated with the place of the Republic in world affairs. . . . This book has been prepared by abridging and combining three earlier books, *The Growth of American Democracy*, *The Republic of the United States*, and *Twentieth Century United States*, and adding new material."

TWENTIETH CENTURY UNITED STATES: A HISTORY. By *Jeannette P. Nichols*, Sometime Professor of History, Wesleyan College. [The Century Historical Series, William E. Lingelbach, Editor.] (*Ibid.*, 1943, pp. xiii, 435, lxxi, \$3.50.) "Chapters I and II of this book have been written solely for it. The greater part of Chapters III-XVII of this book, inasmuch as they covered 1900-1939, has appeared in two earlier works, *The Growth of American Democracy* and Volume II of *The Republic of the United States*; however, some of the material originally in these fifteen chapters has been omitted, their approach has been simplified and some new material has been inserted in them. Chapter XVIII served in large part as the final chapter of Volume II aforesaid; but the last third of it has been rewritten for present purposes. Chapter XIX, the present concluding chapter, is chiefly new narrative."

AMERICAN SOCIETY IN WARTIME. Edited by *William Fielding Ogburn*. [Charles R. Walgreen Foundation Lectures.] (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. vii, 237, \$2.50.) In his introduction Professor Ogburn points out that this volume, containing eleven lectures delivered in the fall of 1942 at the University of Chicago under the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation, does not discuss what the world will be like after the war. It deals, rather, with wartime and the impact of the war upon us now. "Not much could be said about how lasting these effects of war will be," says Professor Ogburn. "Many scars of war will remain after the armistice. On the other hand, some of our institutions will shift back to a peacetime normalcy." The chief value of the book lies in calling direct attention to some of the changes that the war is inducing in our culture. It will then remain, in the years ahead, to follow these changes to ascertain which of them will reflect profound influences in modifying the

pattern of our culture and which are merely temporary. The book thus has a significance for the social historian who will find in it leads for his own further study. The scope of the volume, but not the unevenness of treatment, is indicated by the subjects and authors: "Population," William F. Ogburn; "The Family," Ernest W. Burgess; "The American Town," W. Lloyd Warner; "The Urban Community," Louis Wirth; "Farms and Farming Communities," Lowry Nelson; "Social Science and the Soldier," Samuel A. Stouffer; "The Role of the Citizen," Ellsworth Faris; "The Japanese-Americans," Robert Redfield; "Racial Ideologies," Robert E. Park; "Crime," Edwin H. Sutherland; "Morale," Herbert Blumer. In general, the authors whose approach is statistical have made more useful contributions in that their chapters stimulate interpretations that are grounded in measurable phenomena. The book serves to underline the importance of verification as opposed to mere descriptive interpretation, in any studies of the long-time influence of the war upon social institutions and customs. It makes this contribution to the reader by forcing to his attention the contrast between those chapters that do include concrete data and those that are merely heavy with words. Brief bibliographies accompany each chapter, but obviously they are not intended to be comprehensive.

MALCOLM M. WILLEY

WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS, SEPTEMBER 1, 1939-DECEMBER 31, 1942. Edited by *Louise W. Holborn*. Introduction by Hajo Holborn, Professor of History, Yale University. (Boston, World Peace Foundation, 1943, pp. xv, 730, \$2.50.) Dr. Holborn has collected numerous utterances by official spokesmen for each of the United Nations on the related subjects of war aims and the character of the peace to be established after victory has been achieved. An appendix quotes from statements by the churches, parties, and minority political leaders of the United States and Great Britain. The texts have been assembled and edited with scrupulous care. Abridgments were obviously unavoidable, and the reader may possibly regret excisions from his favorite documents. The editor has, however, been as skillful in this matter as one could legitimately desire. What does seem important is, first, whether the book was issued too soon and, second, whether its purpose is not too restricted. Professor Holborn remarks in his introduction, for instance, that a characteristic of the present war "is the democratic method by which the United Nations try to achieve a solution." He holds that the demons of separatism and secrecy have been exorcised. But does the treaty recently concluded between Russia and Czechoslovakia support this optimistic view? Again, it may perhaps be seriously doubted that the omission of dissident statements by groups having considerable public support can be justified in a book professing to offer an analysis of significant utterances up to the time of publication. Thus the editor does not quote from General Giraud or Lord Vansittart. Spokesmen for the Republican party in the United States are cited, but there is no reference to Mr. Landon or to the vocal Middle Western Senators. These and other omissions tend to strengthen one's impression that the volume is designed to support the worthy thesis that steady progress is being made toward the creation of a strong and stable international society, rather than to supply a realistic, objective account of what the present state of mind in the countries terming themselves the United Nations really happens to be.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER

POSTWAR PLANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS. By *Lewis L. Lorwin*. (New York, Twentieth Century Fund, 1943, pp. 319, \$2.50.) "A factual and objective survey of the proposals and programs for national or domestic postwar reconstruction which have been formulated by governments and government officials, by organized economic groups, and by various social groups in the various countries of the United Nations."

CONNECTICUT YANKEE: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY. By *Wilbur L. Cross*. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1943, pp. viii, 428, \$5.00.) This is truly a delightful book. All the popular reviews have rightly hailed it for its charm, its gentle humor, and shrewd comments. The historian will see in its opening pages on genealogy something typically New England and for its loyalty to rural Connecticut and Yale something typical of a joint product of both. To the history and mores of both it makes a contribution. The historian who turns to it will be more relative in his judgments, more comparative in his estimates of the achievements of both as leaders in political or educational reform. "Uncle Toby," however, was a real leader in both fields. To both he applied slow heat, nothing fiery or quixotic, but he got results. He does not go very deeply into an analysis of the forces that opposed him. The constitution of 1818, which has come unscathed through a century and a quarter, has strewn the state with Old Sarums from which came the hostile majorities that sabotaged his reform bills, but the governor who went in with state majorities supplied by the Manchesters and Birminghams of Connecticut has no comment on it. His hill-town background and the sweep of the national programs under the New Deal enabled Governor Cross to edge the state out of the rear ranks in social legislation. The fact that he was a graduate of Yale College and taught in Sheffield Scientific School enabled him equally well to unite them in putting through a long-overdue organization of a graduate school. There is still something to being born right if you are going to make changes palatable to an old society. A reformer who was equally at home on a cracker box in the corner grocery or in the Yale Graduate Club was born right for the day and the tasks that faced him. Perhaps because he did not often raise his eyes beyond the limits set for him by birth and education, he saw more clearly the scenes and individuals before his eyes and described them more vividly. Perhaps the Connecticut Yankee in him taught Governor Cross early that men and children and institutions sag back when told how much better their opposite number is doing. The reader though unfamiliar with Connecticut or Yale will deeply appreciate the man as a product of both and the book in which he reveals himself. If for no other reason the fact that he retired from Yale at the age limit and then was governor for four terms, eight years, makes a record as unique in American public life as Woodrow Wilson's or John Quincy Adams'.
G.S.F.

STREET CORNER SOCIETY: THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF AN ITALIAN SLUM. By *William Foote Whyte*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. 306.) "The author lived for three and one half years in 'Cornerville' in an eastern city to make this case study of an underprivileged Italian community, emphasizing its relation to the American social structure."

ARTICLES

- J. HALL PLEASANTS. Four Late Eighteenth Century Anglo-American Landscape Painters. *Proc. Am. Antiquarian Soc.*, LII, part 2.
- ARTHUR EDWIN BYE. Edward Hicks (1780-1849). *Bull. Friends Hist. Assoc.*, Autumn.
- COURTNEY LETTS DE ESPIL. Belgrano and Washington—Their Collaboration in Immortality. *Bull. Pan Am. Union.*, Feb.
- RALPH C. ROPER. Thomas Paine: Scientist-Religionist. *Sci. Monthly*, Feb.
- RICHARD HOFSTADTER. William Leggett, Spokesman of Jacksonian Democracy. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Dec.
- WERNER LEVI. The Earliest Relations between the United States of America and Australia. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
- JAMES KITE. Notes on a Tour Made in 1835, I. *Bull. Friends Hist. Assoc.*, Autumn.
- HOWARD R. MARRARO. American Travellers in Rome, 1848-1850. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, Jan.

- SISTER MARIA ALMA. Foundations of Catholic Sisterhoods in the United States, 1850. *Recs. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Sept.
- JULIUS W. PRATT. James K. Polk and John Bull. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- CHARLES H. WESLEY. The Participation of Negroes in Anti-Slavery Political Parties. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Jan.
- GEORGE WINSTON SMITH. Union Propaganda in the American Civil War. *Social Stud.*, Jan.
- EARL S. POMEROY. French Substitutes for American Cotton, 1861-1865. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- RAYMOND G. ROCCA. Fascist Propaganda and a Lincoln Forgery. *Abraham Lincoln Quar.*, Dec.
- BRUCE LANCASTER. Writing a Lincoln Novel—and Others. *Ibid.*
- HARRY E. PRATT. Dr. Anson G. Henry, Lincoln's Physician and Friend, II. *Lincoln Herald*, Dec.
- RALPH G. LINDSTROM. A Californian's Collection of Lincolniana. *Ibid.*
- THOMAS J. PICKETT. Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln (introduction and notes by Ernest E. East). *Ibid.*
- VICTOR F. L. MILLARD. Law and the Florida. *Mariner's Mirror*, Oct.
- A. R. M. LOWER. Two Nations or Two Nationalities. *Culture*, Dec.
- D. D. MCBRIEN. Thomas Jefferson and the Question of Presidential Tenure. *Historian*, Autumn.
- LESTER M. JONES. The Editorial Policy of the Negro Newspapers of 1917-1918 as Compared with That of 1941-1942. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Jan.
- RICHARD S. RODNEY. Historic Parishes—Immanuel Church, New Castle, Delaware: I. The Founding and Some of the Founders; II. Three Notable Women. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Dec.
- WILLIAM WILSON MANROSS. The Episcopal Church and Reform. *Ibid.*
- G. MACLAREN BRYDON. The Origin of the Rights of the Laity in the American Episcopal Church. *Ibid.*
- EDWARD E. DALE. Memories of Frederick Jackson Turner. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- JEROME THOMASES. Freeman Hunt's America. *Ibid.*
- E. O. GUERRANT. The Recognition of El Salvador in 1934: An Alteration in the Foreign Policy of the United States. *Historian*, Autumn.
- JAMES C. MALIN. Mobility and History: Reflections on the Agricultural Policies of the United States in Relation to a Mechanized World. *Agricultural Hist.*, Oct.
- J. WARREN MADDEN. The National Labor Relations Act and Its Administration. *Tennessee Law Rev.*, Feb.
- JUSTICE ROBERT H. JACKSON. Swedish Contributions to Our Law. *Pennsylvania Bar Assoc. Quar.*, Jan.
- FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN. "Bill of Attainder" in the Seventy-eighth Congress. *Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Oct.
- HANSON W. BALDWIN. America at War: The End of the Second Year. *For. Affairs*, Jan.
- SCHUYLER HOSLETT. On the Writing of Administrative History: Civil and Military Agencies. *Americana*, Oct.
- WALTER SULZBACH. The Future of Colonies. *Am. Scholar*, Winter.

DOCUMENTS

- WALTER H. STOWE. John Clark (1762-1841)—Layman: I. The Reuben Clark Family—An Epitome of American Life (1776-1846); II. The Autobiography of John Clark—Layman and Father of Three Clerical Sons. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Dec.

NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

Part I—LETTERS POSTMARKED ROCHESTER: 1817-1879; Part II—SELECTED ARTICLES. Edited by *Blake McKelvey*. [The Rochester Historical Society Publications, XXI.] (Rochester, the Society, 1943, pp. 240.) The letters included in this volume, so we are told, are "only a thin sampling from several fairly large family collections." They are "arranged roughly in a chronological sequence," thus presenting "a fairly continuous panorama of many aspects of Rochester's development from the early village days down into the more tranquil mid-seventies." First among the

six groups into which they are gathered are letters pertaining to the decade 1817-27, when Rochester was but a village. A second group, 1828-42, carries the title "Religious and Social Stirrings." And "Stirrings," be it known, is no misnomer. Although religious problems by no means ceased to concern the people of Rochester after 1842, the other four groups of letters show an increasing interest in business, social and cultural activities, and, during the Civil War period particularly, politics. Of the people represented in the letters, a goodly number (among them Colonel Nathaniel Rochester, for whom the town was named) played active parts in the life and development of Rochester ("America's first boom town"), some have credit for careers not limited to the confines of that town, and not a few of them only now peep from behind a curtain of obscurity. Most of the persons involved are briefly identified by the editor. Among the "Selected Articles" in Part II are one on "The Ancient Little City of Rochester in Kent," by Harriett Julia Naylor; an account of the Rochester music conventions of the 1840's, by Dr. Rolf King; the story of the Genesee Valley Canal, by Major Wheeler Chapin Case; and "Recollections of Fitzhugh Street South of the Canal," by Edward D. Chapin.

ARTICLES

- S. H. LEE WASHINGTON. New Light on the Washingtons of Sulgrave and Brington. *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, Jan.
- Orderly Book Kept by Capt. Abraham Dodge of Ipswich, Jan. 1, to Aug. 1, 1776. *Essex Inst. Hist. Colls.*, Jan.
- RUSSELL LEIGH JACKSON. The Seafaring Browns. *Ibid.*
- JAMES DUNCAN PHILLIPS. Salem's Part in the Naval War with France. *New Eng. Quar.*, Dec.
- MARIAN H. STUDLEY. An "August First" in 1844 [tenth anniversary of the freeing of slaves in the British West Indies]. *Ibid.*
- IRA V. BROWN. The Millerites and the Boston Press. *Ibid.*
- Mrs. HARRY CLARK BODEN. Tradition of Mary Dyer, Quaker Martyr. *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, Jan.
- WILLIAM CARROLL HILL. Memoir of Albert Bushnell Hart. *Ibid.*
- ARTHUR J. ALEXANDER. Judge John Laurance [1750-1810]. *New York Hist.*, Jan.
- GEORGE A. ZABRISKIE. Verrazano. *New-York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull.*, Jan.
- SUSAN E. LYMAN. Latin Americana in the Society's Collections. *Ibid.*
- Records of Dutch Reformed Church of Claverack, Columbia County, New York [cont.]. *New York Geneal. and Biog. Rec.*, Jan.
- ARTHUR PINE VAN GELDER. Van Gelder Families in America. *Ibid.*
- D. G. BRINTON THOMPSON. Samuel B. Ruggles and His Connection with the Erie Canal. *New York Hist.*, Jan.
- ANNE HARTELL. Slavery on Long Island. *Nassau County Hist. Jour.*, Fall.
- JESSE MERRITT. One Long Island Neck of Land: Dosoris, East and West Islands. *Ibid.*
- FREDERICK R. STEVENS. New York in the Society of the Cincinnati. *New York Hist.*, Jan.
- Guide to Depositories of Manuscript Collections in New York State, Supplement no. 4. *New York Hist.*, Jan.
- LEWIS D. COOK. Bergen County Loyalists. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, Jan.
- HENRY E. HALE. Princeton and Kingston Branch Turnpike Road. *Ibid.*
- W. H. ALLEN. Agriculture in the State of New Jersey. *Americana*, Oct.
- C. A. WESLAGER. The Nanticoke Indians in Early Pennsylvania History. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- WILLIAM H. KAIN. The Penn Manorial System and the Manors of Springetsbury and Maske. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, Oct.
- Sister MONICA KIEFER, O.P. Early American Childhood in the Middle Atlantic Area. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Jan.
- FRANK G. SPECK. The Wapanachki Delawares and the English. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- THEODORE THAYER. The Friendly Association. *Ibid.*

- OTTO POLLAK. German Immigrant Problems in Eighteenth Century Pennsylvania as Reflected in Trouble Advertisements. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, Dec.
- ALBAN W. HOOPES. Preliminary Report upon the Correspondence of the Indian Rights Association in the Welsh Collection. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- MARVIN W. SCHLEGEL. The Workingmen's Benevolent Association: First Union of Anthracite Miners. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, Oct.
- WILLIAM A. RUSS, JR. Trends in the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegations (1789-1945). *Ibid.*
- ALBERT POST. Early Efforts to Abolish Capital Punishment in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Jan.
- LLOYD A. BROWN. *The Atlantic Neptune* [London, 1774-84, recently acquired by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania]. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER. Presbyterianism and Revivals in Philadelphia since 1875. *Ibid.*, Jan.
- Supplement to the Guide to the Manuscript Collections in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. *Ibid.*
- WALTER M. KOLLMORGEN. The Agricultural Stability of the Old Order Amish and the Old Order Mennonites of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. *Am. Jour. Sociol.*, Nov.
- FREDERIC A. GODCHARLES. Pennsylvania Statesmanship—at Home and Abroad. *Americana*, Oct.

DOCUMENTS

- LIZZIE NORTON MASON and JAMES DUNCAN PHILLIPS. The Journal of Elizabeth Cranch. *Essex Inst. Hist. Colls.*, Jan.
- GEORGE DAVIS CHASE. Some Washington Allston Correspondence [1837-44]. *New Eng. Quar.*, Dec.
- KEITH HUNTRESS and FRED W. LORCH. Bryant and Illinois: Further Letters of the Poet's Family. *Ibid.*
- CARL J. WEBER. Poet and President [Edwin Arlington Robinson and Theodore Roosevelt]. *Ibid.*
- ARNOLD J. H. VANLAER (tr.). The Lutheran Church in New York, 1649-1772: Records in the Lutheran Church Archives at Amsterdam, Holland. *Bull. New York Public Library*, Jan.
- GRETA G. HUGHES and RICHARD OWEN. A German Duke in America [concl.]. *New York Hist.*, Jan.
- ELSIE SINGMASTER. The Diary of Josephine Forney Roedel [1863-64]. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- MARGARET L. BAILEY. John Adams to Benjamin Rush [July 23, 1806]. *Ibid.*, Jan.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

LEAVES FROM AN OLD WASHINGTON DIARY, 1854-1863. By *Elizabeth Lindsay Lomax*. Edited by *Lindsay Lomax Wood*. (New York, distributed by E. P. Dutton, 1943, pp. 256, \$2.50.) This diary of Elizabeth Lindsay Lomax is disappointing to the historian who is searching for keen reactions and fresh light on public affairs and leaders in a most dramatic era. The writer was nothing more than a most casual, inaccurate, and superficial reporter of events of significance in this troubled period. Although she entertained important public figures and even had a conference with President Pierce, these personages are dismissed with scarcely a nod. The diary is redolent with the domestic atmosphere and hospitality of a charming Southern home which was the center of innumerable social gatherings and entertainment despite the financial impecuniness of the widow Lomax. The weather, callers, parties, quiltings, dresses and styles of the five unmarried daughters who lived at home, soirees, dances, balls, maid troubles, homemade jams, and home remedies for the sick are typical of the contents. The most valuable part of the diary is that which deals with the Southern reaction to the war. The Lomaxes were true Confederates. Lindsay, the son, resigned from the Army to join the Virginia troops. Mrs. Lomax gave up her pension rather than take an oath of allegiance to the United States. The war was one against "my

country." Conscription of residences in Washington brought the remark "and they call this a free country." The writer yearned for peace by Southern victories. Finally, three of the daughters were imprisoned for what must have been subversive activities. The diary, at least as published, gives no hint as to the nature of their doings and abruptly ends at this point in a note of genuine despair, February 2, 1863.

W. M. GEWEHR

MARYLAND DURING AND AFTER THE REVOLUTION: A POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDY. By *Philip A. Crowl*. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXI, Number 1.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943, pp. 185, xiv, \$1.75.) When first this reviewer began to look narrowly into the doings and sayings of the members of that Revolutionary body called the Continental Congress, he was straightway confronted with the question (to put it after the manner of the behaviorists), "What made the members of the Congress behave like human beings?" In other words, he found that, viewed solely from the continental angle, not all their acts and antics were comprehensible. For this a fuller knowledge of their present and antecedent political settings in the states from which they came was essential. (The story of the search for the answer to the question is not for a hardhearted and stiff-necked generation of historians!) It was with a like conviction, namely, that a full understanding of the period of readjustment following the Declaration of Independence requires "exhaustive investigations of the interplay of events, institutions, interests, and personalities within the thirteen individual states," that the author undertook this study. From his study Dr. Crowl comes forth with the further conviction that, although there were similar, even identical, problems and processes among the several states, "the transition in each was in many ways unique." And Maryland in particular manifested idiosyncrasies all her own. At the beginning of the Revolution the government of Maryland was aristocratic, that is to say, was dominated by "a relatively small class of planters, lawyers, and merchants," and it remained so, despite "a continuous current of democratic insurgency," at all times manifest to a greater or less degree. The author is very definitely of the conviction that there was no "critical period" in Maryland, critical, that is, in the sense of a threatening anarchy. "The forces of law and order," he maintains, "never lost the upper hand in Maryland." The last two chapters, dealing with the Federal Constitution in Maryland and including a close-up view of the ratifying convention, are particularly valuable contributions to the history of that contest. One unique contribution is a conspectus of relationships among Maryland families. The late Dr. J. Franklin Jameson often suggested as a desideratum of American history a dissertation on brothers-in-law. (I think that is the way he put it. I am sure it was not mothers-in-law.) Here, so far as this reviewer recalls, is the first approach to such a dissertation.

EDMUND C. BURNETT

THE LETTERS OF DON JUAN MCQUEEN TO HIS FAMILY, WRITTEN FROM SPANISH EAST FLORIDA, 1791-1807. With a Biographical Sketch and Notes by *Walter Charlton Hartridge*. (Columbia, South Carolina, published for the Georgia Society of the Colonial Dames of America by Bostick and Thornley, 1943, pp. xxxiv, 89, \$2.50.) John McQueen, a Carolinian with a passion for speculation in land which no amount of ill success could daunt, chose to leave his timber lands and plantations in middle Georgia and the Sea Islands in 1791, when creditors and tax collectors became pressing, and betake himself to east Florida. There, parted from his family and a convert to the Roman Catholic faith, he was able to renew his former occupations, aided by sundry grants from the Spanish authorities and his appointment to various official positions, and differing from other American settlers in Florida at that

time mainly in his loyalty to his new sovereign. Some of his letters, principally to one of his daughters, are piously exhumed and decently published in the volume now before us. They are purely family letters and add little to the sketch of McQueen's life given by the editor; while concerning that little-known byway of American history, the period of resumed Spanish rule in east Florida after its retrocession by Great Britain in 1783, they are disappointingly barren of information. The notes, briefly and competently identifying persons mentioned in the letters of this widely connected Southerner, will make the book of some value to genealogists. The curious may compare the portrait of McQueen which the letters present with that done in charcoal in *The St. Johns: A Parade of Diversities* (New York, 1943), pp. 138-47, by Branch Cabell and A. J. Hanna, the latter of whom contributes an introduction to the present volume.

C. L. MOWAT

RECORDS OF THE MORAVIANS IN NORTH CAROLINA. Edited by *Adelaide L. Fries*, Archivist of the Moravian Church in America, Southern Province. [Publications of the North Carolina Historical Commission.] Volume VI, 1793-1808. (Raleigh, North Carolina Historical Commission, 1943, pp. x, 2451-3017.) It is doubtful that American historians, at least aside from those writing specifically on North Carolina history, are fully aware of the significance of these *Records*, of the light which they throw upon important phases of life in this country in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. As the editor wrote in her foreword to Volume I, "The Moravian Brethren had a habit of keeping careful daily records . . . because of the strong desire for correct information about, and constant communication between, the widely scattered portions of the Unity." And as Dr. Rondthaler wrote in his preface to the same volume, "The Moravians were acute and watchful analysts." They recorded every phase of their community life and commented, often with surprising astuteness, on national and foreign affairs. An illustration of how the various congregations were mutually helpful appears on pages 2462-63 of the present volume. News had come to the Wachovia settlement that fires had virtually destroyed the buildings in two Silesian communities, Gnadenfrey and Gnadenfeld. Within a short time the brethren in Wachovia were able to record that their own and other widely scattered settlements of the unity had raised and forwarded "a large part of the amount needed to rebuild the burned houses." Their pacifism is illustrated by their resolution following the death of George Washington. No mention appears as to his military achievements in obtaining independence. The only specific reference to his service is that he "through the past ten years has been so much concerned with attempts to preserve the peace with the warring powers of Europe" (p. 2644). A special feature of this volume is the inclusion of several pages of the Bethabara Diary for the period January 25-February 23, 1777. These pages were missing when the appropriate volume was published, the editor explains, but have since been located. They are of especial interest because of their descriptions of Regulators who came through their community (Part III, especially pp. 2941-43). Miss Fries has done a most commendable job in translating and editing these papers.

ALEX M. ARNETT

THE ST. JOHNS: A PARADE OF DIVERSITIES. By *Branch Cabell* and *A. J. Hanna*. Illustrated by Doris Lee. [The Rivers of America.] (New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1943, pp. x, 324, \$2.50.) This volume is unique in a series planned to portray American life, as conceived by literary masters, against the background of river valleys. It is unique as the joint work of a Virginia novelist and a Florida historian. It is unique as a book of history, evincing, in some degree, the historian's methodology. It is unique also as an addition to the romantic literature of Florida, imbued with a devastating

romanticism which may amaze, perplex, and irritate the serious-minded devotee of changing scenes along the St. Johns. Written in the usual Cabell fashion, it has a vivid, mordant, ironical, and exaggerated style and frequent bits of cryptic, pointed expression more or less related to the main theme. It makes good reading. It is sufficiently diverting. The book was completed after more than a year's work by the authors. They viewed the history of the St. Johns people, Cabell says, as a "grotesque and highly colored pageant which, as if under the influence of an enchantment just slightly sinister, has trooped toward us from out of our river's past, and which now evades us" (p. 303). About half the book is devoted to the colonial period; the remainder deals with the nineteenth century. In the passing parade are many familiar figures: Ribaut, Menendez, Oglethorpe, James Grant, Bartram, Audubon, Jefferson, Jackson, T. W. Higginson, Harriet B. Stowe. Others in the motley array are less well known but are sketched in a fashion no less colorful and unflattering. A few, notably Napoleon B. Broward, serve to remind the reader that democracy, no less than human nature, nonetheless hath its virtues. Not all the book is concerned with the procession of diversities. There is considerable incidental material on the river, on historical events, on steamboats, and on certain phases of social and economic conditions. This is a book to be enjoyed. It can be judged most appropriately as a literary work and a very creditable one.

G. LEIGHTON LAFUZE

OUR CATHOLIC HERITAGE IN TEXAS, 1519-1936. By *Carlos E. Castañeda*. Prepared under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus of Texas, *James P. Gibbons*, Editor. Volume V, THE MISSION ERA: THE END OF THE SPANISH REGIME, 1780-1810. (Austin, Von Boeckmann-Jones, 1942, pp. 514, \$5.00.) This new volume in Professor Castañeda's full-scale treatment of the history of Texas, as in the case of the earlier volumes (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLV, 985, with reference to prior reviews), exhibits sound scholarship, wide use of published materials, and extensive utilization of unexploited documents. Somewhat delayed in publication by the unfortunate death of the general editor, Dr. Foik, it nevertheless maintains the high standards set by the earlier volumes. Covering, as it does, the last years of Spanish control, it is especially notable for a calm discussion of the secularization of the missions and a valuable history of new missionary establishments, which, paradoxically enough, followed this termination. The accounts of contemporary relations with New Mexico, the transfer of Louisiana, of United States relations and colonization, French intervention, and conditions in Texas prior to the independence of Mexico are enriched with fresh narratives drawn from hitherto unexplored archival sources. A diligent search of the footnotes and the extensive bibliography reveals no serious omissions and much that is novel and of first-rate importance. All interested in the field hope that the author, with his proved ability and the wide command of published and unpublished material at his disposition, will push his project into the present as soon as the war and his associated duties will permit.

ARTHUR S. AITON

TEXAS COUNTY HISTORIES: A BIBLIOGRAPHY. By *Horace Bailey Carroll*. (Austin, Texas State Historical Association, 1943, pp. 222, \$3.50.)

ARTICLES

- JAMES C. BONNER. Genesis of Agricultural Reform in the Cotton Belt. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
 HOWARD C. PERKINS. The Defense of Slavery in the Northern Press on the Eve of the Civil War. *Ibid.*
 FRANK W. KLINGBERG. James Buchanan and the Crisis of the Union. *Ibid.*
 JAMES BOYD. The South and the Fight. *Atlantic Monthly*, Feb.
 JOHN M. GIBSON. The Miracle Man of the Confederacy [Josiah Gorgas]. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Jan.

- H. H. HOYT. Social Origins of Southern Senators in Congress at the Time of the Civil War. *Social Stud.*, Jan.
- J. CARLYLE SITTERSON. The Transition from Slave to Free Economy on the William J. Minor Plantations. *Agricultural Hist.*, Oct.
- JOSEPHINE FISHER. Bennet Allen, Fighting Parson [I]. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, Dec.
- MILBOURNE CHRISTOPHER. Magic in Early Baltimore. *Ibid.*
- LOUIS DOW SCISCO. Captain Robert Morris of Ratcliffe Manor. *Ibid.*
- MAURICE A. MOOK. The Ethnological Significance of Tindall's Map of Virginia, 1608. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, Oct.
- FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON. Harrisons in Virginia during the Reign of James I [concl.]. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- GEORGE CARRINGTON MASON. The Colonial Churches of King and Queen and King William Counties, Virginia. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, Oct.
- CHARLES EDGAR GILLIAM. Legal Holidays Peculiar to Colonial Virginia. *Ibid.*
- FISKE KIMBALL. In Search of Jefferson's Birthplace. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- PHILIP G. AUCHAMPAUGH. Washington's Birthday, 1860. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Jan.
- G. MACLAREN BRYDON. English Education of Thomas Nelson, jr., of Yorktown. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- MALCOLM H. HARRIS. Port Towns of the Pamunkey. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, Oct.
- GRACE WARREN LANDRUM. Which Hugh Jones? *Ibid.*
- KENNETH P. BAILEY. George Mason, Westerner. *Ibid.*
- C. H. AMBLER. General R. E. Lee's Northwest Virginia Campaign. *West Virginia Hist.*, Jan.
- HOWARD N. EAVENSON. Notes on an Old West Virginia Coal Field. *Ibid.*
- ALONZO THOMAS DILL, jr. Public Buildings in Craven County, 1722-1835. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
- BELL IRVIN WILEY. Camp Newspapers of the Confederacy. *Ibid.*
- DOUGLAS C. MCMURTRIE. Some Nineteenth Century South Carolina Imprints, 1801-1820 [concl.]. *South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Oct.
- JAMES W. SILVER. General Gaines Meets Governor Troup: A State-Federal Clash in 1825. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, Sept.
- E. MERTON COULTER. Boating as a Sport in the Old South. *Ibid.*
- RICHARD BEALE DAVIS. Forgotten Scientists in Georgia and South Carolina. *Ibid.*
- KENNETH W. PORTER. Seminole Flight from Fort Marion. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
- T. FREDERICK DAVIS. Pioneer Florida: Admission to Statehood, 1845. *Ibid.*
- CHARLES L. MOWAT. The First Campaign of Publicity for Florida. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.
- HERBERT APTHEKER. Notes on Slave Conspiracies in Confederate Mississippi. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Jan.
- PIERRE DE LA VERGNE. Early Economic Life in Louisiana, 1804-1824 (An Historical Dialogue). *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- JOHN SMITH KENDALL. Joseph Jefferson in New Orleans. *Ibid.*
- VAN D. ODOM. The Political Career of Thomas Overton Moore, Secession Governor of Louisiana. *Ibid.*
- LUCIA ELIZABETH DANIEL. The Louisiana People's Party. *Ibid.*
- OLIVE TODD WALKER. Esther Amanda Sherrill Cullins: A Pioneer Woman of the Texas Frontier. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
- FRANK E. VANDIVER. Texas and the Confederate Army's Meat Problem. *Ibid.*
- H. BAILEY CARROLL. Texas Collection. *Ibid.*, Oct., Jan.
- J. W. WILLIAMS. The National Road of the Republic of Texas. *Ibid.*, Jan.

DOCUMENTS

- DORIS MASLIN COHN. Letters of the Haynie Family [1790-96]. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, Dec.
- Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister [concl.]. *Ibid.*
- WILLIAM D. HOYT, jr. The Calvert-Stier Correspondence [concl.]. *Ibid.*
- HOWARD R. MARRARO. Mazzei Correspondence during His American Mission to Europe, 1780-1783 [II]. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, Oct.

- W. A. BRYAN. Minor Washingtoniana. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Jan.
- MAUD H. WOODFIN. Auditor Stegge's Accounts [concl.]. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.
- ROSS B. JOHNSTON. West Virginians in the American Revolution [McClain to Morgan]. *West Virginia Hist.*, Jan.
- JOSEPH STEWART. Extract from a Letter by Pastor Storch in North Carolina, dated Salisbury, January 20–February 25, 1796. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, Oct.
- JAMES A. PADGETT. Reconstruction Letters from North Carolina, IX, Letters to Benjamin Franklin Butler [cont.]. *Ibid.*
- ROBERT L. BRUNHOUSE. David Ramsay on the Ratification of the Constitution of South Carolina, 1787–1788. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- SAMUEL GAILLARD STONEY. The Memoirs of Frederick Augustus Porcher [cont.]. *South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Oct.
- Elijah Clarke's "Trans-Oconee Republic" [U. S. Attorney General Walker to Governor Mathews, August 30, 1794]. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, Sept.
- DOROTHY DODD. The Miller of Okahumpka [James Gough]. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
- WEYMOUTH T. JORDAN. The Management Rules of an Alabama Black Belt Plantation, 1848–1862. *Agricultural Hist.*, Jan.
- FRANK E. VANDIVER. A Collection of Louisiana Confederate Letters. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- E. W. WINKLER. Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846–1876 [IV]. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Jan.

WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

THE BEGINNINGS OF CATHOLICISM IN SOUTH DAKOTA. By Sister M. Claudia Duratschek, O. S. B., Sacred Heart Convent, Yankton, South Dakota. (Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1943, pp. xiii, 271.) Nearly half of this careful study is devoted to the work of the church among the Sioux. Government Indian policy, missionary activities, and Sioux customs and practices are well and interestingly described. The deeds of men such as Fathers Pierre De Smet, Augustine Ravoux, Christian Hoecken, and Martin Marty evoke admiration, as do the courage and zeal of numerous sisters who faced hardships in early Dakota. The remainder of the volume deals with the settlement of South Dakota by the white man and the accompanying expansion of Catholicism. Reader interest is assured by the inclusion of much absorbing detail: frontier wedding practices, Bohemian and German-Russian customs, parish rifts, and early life in the Black Hills. The final chapter, entitled "The Catholic Church, A Constructive Force," is concerned mainly with the position of the church on matters of education, divorce, birth control, sickness, temperance, and woman suffrage. Sister M. Claudia Duratschek's dissertation shows evidence of careful preparation, much effort, and a great admiration for the early Catholic workers of Dakota. This latter quality might well have allowed bias to creep into her work. On page 212 in her remark on civil marriage and on page 246 in the generalization concerning the law-abiding quality of Catholics she has allowed herself to make sweeping statements. Generally, however, her work is fair and judicious, and no attempt is made to smooth over the rough spots, such as the scandal involving a nun in Yankton in 1883 (p. 159). The work is well annotated; there is a map that adds to the understanding of the text; the bibliography is excellent; and the index is fairly good, though it suffers from some omissions, such as Ravoux, and some errors, such as "John P. Riggs" for "Stephen R. Riggs." Anyone interested in South Dakota or in church history will find this volume enjoyable and worth his time.

MERRILL E. JARCHOW

HISTORY OF THE EARLY SETTLEMENTS OF DENVER (1599–1860), WITH REPRODUCTIONS OF THE FIRST CITY DIRECTORY, THE 1859 MAP, THE FIRST ISSUE OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS, AND THE RARE CHERRY

CREEK PIONEER. By *Nolie Mumey*, Lecturer in Medical History, University of Colorado School of Medicine. (Glendale, Arthur H. Clark, 1942, pp. xvi, 213, \$6.00.) This book was written by a physician whose avocation is Western history. Its chief contribution consists in the reproduction in exact size of four important documents (listed above) which have to do with Denver in the year 1859. In making these rare items available in facsimile a useful service has been performed. In addition there are nearly fourscore illustrations of persons, places, and things connected with the early history of Denver and Colorado. Besides their local interest, these have some significance for the social history of the far West. The text of the book will be a disappointment to those familiar with the history of Denver. It adds little to the material already available in the histories of Colorado and is marred by numerous inaccuracies and a lack of precision in the quotations. The date 1599 on the title page rests on the surmise, set forth in two sentences (p. 23), that a Spanish explorer was at the mouth of Cherry Creek in that year. But the author himself casts doubt on this by another statement (p. 20): "The first white man to visit the present site of Denver was James Pursley . . . in 1803." The data in the book relate mainly to the years 1857-60 and are grouped under such chapter headings as "Gold Discovered," "Oakes Party," "Pioneer Activities," "Civic Affairs," etc. The approach is essentially antiquarian, with the usual attention to "firsts": first flag, first house, first marriage, first baby, and so on. All this has its place, and good local studies of this sort should be encouraged; but it is not likely that many of them will be issued so elaborately as this one.

COLIN B. GOODYKOONTZ

ARTICLES

- DOUGLAS C. MCMURTRIE. An Early Project to Establish a Province of Georgia in the Region now Known as Kentucky. *Filson Club Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
- ALLEN E. RAGAN. John J. Crittenden, 1787-1863. *Ibid.*
- W. C. BARRICKMAN. Political Nominating Convention [1830]. *Ibid.*
- JOHN D. BARNHART. The Tennessee Constitution of 1796: A Product of the Old West. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.
- MRS. JOHN TROTWOOD MOORE. Records of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1807, 1808 [cont.]. *Tennessee Hist. Quar.*, Dec.
- ARDA WALKER. Andrew Jackson, Planter. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Pubs.*, 1943.
- CHARLOTTE WILLIAMS. Congressional Action on the Admission of Tennessee into the Union. *Tennessee Hist. Quar.*, Dec.
- JAMES W. LIVINGOOD. Chattanooga, Tennessee: Its Economic History in the Years Immediately Following Appomattox. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Pubs.*, 1943.
- VERTON M. QUEENER. The East Tennessee Republicans as a Minority Party, 1870-1896. *Ibid.*
- ALLEN E. RAGAN. Mr. Justice Sanford. *Ibid.*
- MARTHA L. ELLISON. Writings on Tennessee History, 1942. *Ibid.*
- LAURA E. LUTTRELL and POLLYANNA CREEKMORE. Writings on Tennessee Counties [Knox to Wilson]. *Tennessee Hist. Quar.*, Dec.
- WILLIAM C. BINKLEY. Some Undeveloped Phases of Tennessee History. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Pubs.*, 1943.
- DAVID BACON. An Unsuccessful Mission to the Shawanese, 1802. *Northwestern Ohio Quar.*, Jan. [Formerly *Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio's Quarterly Bulletin.*]
- FRANCIS P. WEISENBURGER. Northwestern Ohio a Hundred Years Ago. *Ibid.*
- KATHRYN KELLER MILLER. A Tavern Every Mile. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- WILLARD H. SMITH. Schuyler Colfax and Reconstruction Policy. *Indiana Mag. Hist.*, Dec.
- JOSEPH B. JAMES. The Immediate Purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Ibid.*
- J. F. SNYDER. The Old French Towns of Illinois in 1839: A Reminiscence. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, Dec.
- CLARENCE P. MCCLELLAND. The Education of Females in Early Illinois. *Ibid.*
- G. E. NELSON. The Genesis of Restored New Salem. *Ibid.*

- CHARLES F. MULLETT. Doctor John J. Lowry: A Frontier Physician. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
- REINHARD H. LUTHIN. Organizing the Republican Party in the "Border-Slave" Regions: Edward Bates' Presidential Candidacy in 1860. *Ibid.*
- GEORGE T. NESS, JR. Missouri at West Point: Her Graduates through the Civil War Years. *Ibid.*
- WILLIAM W. POTTER. The Michigan Judiciary since 1805. *Michigan Hist. Mag.*, Oct.-Dec.
- OWEN J. CLEARY. Michigan State Troops: Historical Background. *Ibid.*
- SISTER M. ROSALITA. Gabriel Richard, American. *Ibid.*
- B. PHILLIS ARMITAGE. A Study of Michigan's Place-Names. *Ibid.*
- WILLIS FREDERICK DUNBAR. The Opera House as a Social Institution in Michigan. *Ibid.*
- HAROLD C. BROOKS. Story of the Founding of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. *Ibid.*
- LONDON TAYLOR. Pioneer Ministry. *Palimpsest*, Jan.
- R. E. HARVEY. Reopening a Closed Chapter: Historical Sketch of the Des Moines Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1832-1860. *An. Iowa*, Jan.
- REEVES HALL. First Iowa Husking Meets. *Palimpsest*, Nov.
- MARSHALL BIDWELL. Famous American War Songs. *An. Iowa*, Jan.
- F. PAUL PRUCHA. Minnesota's Attitude toward the Southern Case for Secession. *Minnesota Hist.*, Dec.
- MERRILL E. JARCHOW. Farm Machinery of the 1860's in Minnesota. *Ibid.*
- EARL V. CHAPIN. The Early History of the Roseau Valley. *Ibid.*
- EARL S. POMEROY. Lincoln, the Thirteenth Amendment, and the Admission of Nevada. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
- MIRIAM STANLEY CARLETON-SQUIRES. Music of Pioneer Days in Nebraska [concl.]. *Nebraska Hist.*, Oct.-Dec.
- JOSEPH C. REAVIS. Ninety Years of Nebraska Settlement. *Ibid.*
- F. D. EAGER. The Spanish-American War. *Ibid.*, July-Sept.
- DANIEL GARBER. The Winning of the War to Preserve Nebraska History. *Ibid.*, Oct.-Dec.
- MRS. HAL RUSSELL. Memoirs of Mrs. Mary Russell [cont.]. *Colorado Mag.*, Jan.
- ROBERT C. DUNBAR. Agricultural Adjustments in Eastern Colorado in the Eighteen-Nineties. *Agricultural Hist.*, Jan.
- MARIE H. ERWIN. Statistical Reports on the Sickness and Mortality of the U. S. Army, 1819-1860. *An. Wyoming*, Oct.
- GIBSON CLARK [1844-1914]. Reminiscences of Civil War Days. *Ibid.*
- BERLIN B. CHAPMAN. Establishment of the Iowa Reservation. *Chron. Oklahoma*, Dec.
- ABRAHAM ELEAZER KNEPLER. Education in the Cherokee Nation. *Ibid.*
- LOOMIS M. GANAWAY. New Mexico and the Sectional Controversy, 1846-1861. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
- GEORGE WINSTON SMITH. New Mexico's Wartime Food Problems, 1917-1918 [concl.]. *Ibid.*
- S. B. L. PENROSE. The Wagon Train of 1843—Its Dual Significance. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, Dec.
- CLAUDIUS O. JOHNSON. George Turner of Supreme Court of Washington Territory. *Ibid.*
- RANDALL V. MILLS. Early Electric Interurbans in Oregon [II]. *Ibid.*
- LEWIS A. McARTHUR. Oregon Geographic Names: Fifth Supplement. *Ibid.*
- EDWARD SHEPPARD and EMILY JOHNSON. Forty Years of Symphony in Seattle, 1903-1943. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Jan.
- CHARLES M. GATES. A Proposed Program of Research in Pacific Northwest History. *Ibid.*
- NORMAN and UNA HAYNER. Three Generations of Pacific Northwest Indians. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, Dec.
- WILLIAM A. RUSS, JR. The Role of Sugar in Hawaiian Annexation. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

DOCUMENTS

- D. C. and ROBERTA CORBITT. Papers from the Spanish Archives Relating to Tennessee and the Old Southwest, 1783-1800 [VII]. *East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Pubs.*, 1943.
- WEYMOUTH T. JORDAN. Excerpts from the Diary of a Tennessean [George Washington Campbell] at the Court of the Tsar, 1818-1820. *Ibid.*
- JAMES RILEY [1777-1840]. Founding of Willshire [letter to John F. Watson, July 3, 1824]. *Northwestern Ohio Quar.*, Jan.

- Father [Joseph P.] Machebeuf on the Sandusky [letters, 1840-42, to his sister and father, reprinted from Howlett's *Life*]. *Ibid.*
- HOWARD C. PERKINS. Northern Ohio Scene, 1839. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- J. HERMAN SCHAUINGER. The Letters of Godlove S. Orth [1843-49]. *Indiana Mag. Hist.*, Dec.
- MARION H. HERRIOT. Through Minnesota to the Canadian West in 1869. *Minnesota Hist.*, Dec.
- FRANK FREIDEL. A Whaler in Pacific Ports, 1841-42. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Jan.

Latin-American History

James Ferguson King

GENERAL

CONFERENCIAS PRONUNCIADAS POR SUS AUTORES EN LA SALA DE LA ACADEMIA EN EL AÑO DE 1943. [Academia Colombiana de Historia.] (Bogotá, Editorial de la Librería Voluntad, S. A., pp. 351, paper.)

LA INTERVENCIÓN EXTRANJERA EN EL RÍO DE LA PLATA, 1838-1850: ESTUDIO DE LA POLÍTICA SEGUIDA POR FRANCIA, GRAN BRETAÑA Y NORTEAMERICA CON RESPECTO AL DICTADOR JUAN MANUEL DE ROSAS. Por *John F. Cady*, Profesor Adjunto de Historia, Marshall College, Universidad de Pensilvania. Traducción de *Juan M. Uteda*. Introducción de Luis A. Podestá Costa. [Biblioteca de la Sociedad de Historia Argentina, XIV.] (Buenos Aires, Editorial Losada, S. A., 1943, pp. 307.)

DEPOIS DE EÇA DE QUEIROZ . . . PERSPECTIVA DA LITERATURA PORTUGUESA NOVECENTISTA, SEGUIDA DE UMA CONFERENCIA SOBRE A HISTORIOGRAFIA PORTUGUESA DO SÉCULO XX. By *Fidelino de Figueiredo*. [Coleção E. C. C., Série I, No. 2.] (São Paulo, Editora Clássico-Científica S/A., 1943, pp. 134.) The latter part of this little volume concerns not only Portuguese historiography but also the historical writers of Brazil, as well as the interrelations of workers in this field in the two major parts of the Portuguese-speaking world.

A SELECTIVE GUIDE TO THE ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NETHERLANDS WEST INDIES, WITH A SUPPLEMENT ON BRITISH GUIANA. By *Philip Hanson Hiss*. [Booklets of the Netherlands Information Bureau.] (New York, Netherlands Information Bureau, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, 1943, pp. xiii, 129, 75 cents.) Dutch America is, in all likelihood, the portion of the New World least known to inhabitants of the United States. This bibliography, compiled by a Brooklynite who has resided in the area and who is currently turning out numerous works on it, is designed to acquaint the American public with the economic value of the Dutch Caribbean to the mother country and the numerous economic, social, and political problems attending its exploitation. It is a useful work from every point of view, but its publication at Dutch government expense naturally raises the question as to why the latter should undertake to educate Americans on the subject. **LOWELL RAGATZ**

ARTICLES

- SALVADOR GARCÍA FRANCO. La geografía astronómica y Colón. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Jan., 1943.
- CONSTANTINO BAYLE. La comunión entre los indios americanos. *Ibid.*, Apr., 1943.
- JAMES FERGUSON KING. Negro History in Continental Spanish America. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, Jan.
- JOHN J. JOHNSON. The Excellence of the Spanish Horse. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
- Id.* The Introduction of the Horse into the Western Hemisphere. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Nov.

- RAFAEL ARÉVALO MARTÍNEZ. Influencia de España en la formación de la nacionalidad centro-americana. *Rev. Mus. Bib.*, July.
- Breve historia de la música en Guatemala. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- RAFAEL HELIODORO VALLE. Algunos franceses en México. *Filosofía y Letras*, July.
- ROBERTO DE LA CERDA SILVA. Los tarahumaras. *Rev. Mex. Soc.*, July.
- WALTER B. L. BOSE. Desarrollo histórico del correo en España (1250-1822). *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.
- Id.* Los orígenes del correo marítimo español a las Indias Occidentales (1500-1764), y los correos mayores de Indias residentes en España (1514-1706). *Ibid.*
- RICHARD F. BEHRENDT. Aspectos sociales y económicos del Istmo de Panamá durante la época del tráfico primitivo (1519-1848). *Rev. Mex. Soc.*, primer trimestre, 1943.
- JOSÉ TORRE REVELLO. Merchandise Shipped by the Spaniards to America (1534-1586). *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Nov.
- HERSCHEL BRICKELL. Popayán, Cradle of Colombia. *Virginia Quar. Rev.*, Winter.
- ENRIQUE ÁLVAREZ Y LÓPEZ. La filosofía natural en el padre José de Acosta. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Apr., 1943.
- FRANÇOIS CHEVALIER. Les cargaisons des flotes de la Nouvelle Espagne vers 1600. *Ibid.*
- ENRIQUE DE GANDÍA. Buenos Aires, y los indios de la pampa. *Rev. Geog. Am.*, July.
- CLEMENTE PÉREZ VALDÉS. Una casa solariega. *Bol. Acad. Chilena Hist.*, Jan., 1943.
- GUILLERMINA SORS DE TRICERRI. Orígenes del pueblo y partido de Colón. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.
- WALTER B. L. BOSE. Córdoba, centro de las comunicaciones postales en las Provincias Unidas del Río de la Plata. *Ibid.*
- ENRIQUE MILLÁN. Génesis de la emancipación americana. *Rev. Indias* (Bogotá), no. 56 (1943).
- BERNABÉ RIVEROS. América y la democracia. *Ibid.*
- THOMAS B. DAVIS, JR. Carlos de Alvear and James Monroe: New Light on the Origin of the Monroe Doctrine. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Nov.
- WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON. An Early Threat of Intervention by Force in South America. *Ibid.*
- GEORGE SARTON. Fifth Preface to Volume XXXIV. Aimé Bonpland. *Isis*, Summer.
- C. ALLEN TRUE. John A. Williams, Champion of Mexico in the Early Days of the Texas Revolution. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- TOMÁS RUEDA VARGAS. El señor Caro y el tratado Herrán-Hay. *Rev. Indias* (Bogotá), no. 57 (1943).
- SEWARD W. LIVERMORE. Battleship Diplomacy in South America: 1905-1925. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Mar.
- ALUYISIO GUEDES REGIS BITTENCOURT. Friendship between Brazil and the United States. *Bull. Pan Am. Union*, Jan.
- The Presidency in the Americas: Constitutional Provisions. *Ibid.*
- Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense. *Ibid.*, Oct.
- CHARLES G. FENWICK. The Coördination of Inter-American Peace Agreements. *Am. Jour. Internat. Law*, Jan.
- SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS. Walter Lippmann on U. S. Foreign Policy. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Nov.
- ROSCOE R. HILL. A Latin American Speaks [review article on Luis Quintanilla's book]. *Ibid.*
- ISABEL DE PALENCIA. Falange in the New World. *Inter-Am.*, Feb.
- RICHARD PATTEE. A Revisionist Approach to Hispanic American Studies. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, Jan.
- JOHN ERSKINE. The Humanities in the Americas. *Am. Scholar*, Winter.
- ARCHIBALD MACLEISH. Aid to the National Library of Peru. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Nov.
- OSWALDO DÍAZ DÍAZ. La historia y don Tomás Rueda Vargas. *Rev. Indias* (Bogotá), no. 55 (1943).

DOCUMENTS

- WALTER B. L. BOSE. Apéndice documental [concerning the correo marítimo between Spain and the Indies, 1514-1633]. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.

INDEXES, BIBLIOGRAPHY, AND ARCHIVE GUIDES

- Índice del ramo de tierras [volumenes 1427-42]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), Apr., July, 1943.

- [Archival indices of *ramos* of the Venezuelan Archivo Nacional]. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Caracas), Mar., May, 1943.
- LAURA L. PORTEOUS and WALTER PRICHARD. Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, LXXVIII, February–March, 1785 [cont.]. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Oct.
- Índice de los documentos existentes en el Archivo General del Gobierno [1814–16]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Gob.*, Sept.
- Índice general de los libros copiadore de la sección de relaciones exteriores (Archivo General de la Nación.—Sección F.) [1857] [cont.]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (Ciudad Trujillo), May.
- A List of Mexican Articles Appearing in *Inter-America* (1917–1926). *Mex. Rev.*, Summer.

COLONIAL PERIOD

NORTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

THE DISCOVERY OF NEW SPAIN IN 1518. By *Juan de Grijalva*. A translation of the original texts with an Introduction and Notes by *Henry R. Wagner*. [Documents and Narratives Concerning the Discovery and Conquest of Latin America, the Cortes Society, new series, number two.] (Berkeley, Cortes Society, 1942, pp. 208.) The era of discovery in Latin America has not been intensively studied by many scholars in England or in the United States. The volume under review, which is published in a limited edition in a new series of publications by the revived Cortes Society, is accordingly a welcome addition to the scanty materials in English concerning the discovery and conquest of Middle America. Besides an introduction by the editor, this book contains his critical estimates of various accounts of the expedition to that region of Juan de Grijalva. These narratives were written by Juan Díaz, Peter Martyr, Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, Alonso de Santa Cruz, Francisco López de Gómara, Bartolomé de Las Casas, Francisco Cervantes de Salazar, Bernal Díaz del Castillo, and the *Regimiento* of Vera Cruz. Then follows a brief narrative of Grijalva's exploit by Mr. Wagner and a list of the leading members of the expedition. In the appendix are printed translations, with one exception done into English by the editor, of Ferdinand Flores' *Provinciae*, the *Itinerario* of Juan Díaz, the letter of the *Regimiento*, Oviedo's account of the expedition, the tale of López de Gómara, the narrative of Las Casas, and that of Cervantes de Salazar. Sixteen pages of erudite notes by the editor contain references to authorities. Wagner's conclusion is not only that there is "little agreement among the sources" about the Grijalva expedition but also that it is impossible to reconcile them. Though the account by Las Casas is the most interesting, Wagner believes that the *Itinerario* by Díaz and the journal printed by Oviedo, which supplement each other, are the most trustworthy. Some fifty pages of this book are devoted to Wagner's English version of Oviedo's account. Unfortunately the language employed by the editor is not always perfectly clear. Seven maps and archaeological views illustrate the work. This volume would have been more useful to scholars if the original texts of the most important accounts of the expedition had accompanied the translations.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON

ARTICLES

- MIGUEL SALINAS ALANÍS. Bienes y tributos del Estado y Marquesado del Valle de Oaxaca. *Mem. Acad. Mex. Hist.*, Oct.
- FRANCISCO PÉREZ SALAZAR. Contestación al discurso anterior [refers to preceding article]. *Ibid.* El cuarto centenario de la antigua ciudad de Santiago de los Caballeros de Guatemala. *Rev. Mus. Bib.*, Apr., 1943.
- JOSÉ LÓPEZ-PORTELLO y WEBER. Los cronistas de la conquista de la Nueva Galicia. *Mem. Acad. Mex. Hist.*, July.

- ATANASIO G. SARAVIA. Contestación al discurso anterior [José López-Portillo y Weber, *Los cronistas de la conquista de la Nueva Galicia*]. *Ibid.*
- WIGBERTO JIMÉNEZ MORENO. La colonización y evangelización de Guanajuato. *Cuad. Am.*, Jan.
- PABLO MARTÍNEZ DEL RÍO. La aventura mexicana de Sir John Hawkins. *Mem. Acad. Mex. Hist.*, July.
- ERWIN WALTER PALM. El estilo imperial de Felipe II y las edificaciones del siglo XVII en la Española. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (Ciudad Trujillo), May.
- JOSÉ TORIBIO MEDINA. José de Pineda Ibarra (1660-1679). *Bol. Mus. Bib.*, Jan., 1943.
- JOSÉ ANTONIO CALDERÓN QUIJANO. El fuerte de San Fernando de Omoa: Su historia e importancia que tuvo en la defensa del golfo de Honduras [concl.]. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Jan., 1943.
- CARLOS PÉREZ-MALDONADO. La medalla de la estatua ecuestre de Carlos IV. *Mem. Acad. Mex. Hist.*, Oct.
- MANUEL ROMERO DE TERREROS Y VINENT. El tercer Conde de Regla. *Ibid.*, July.
- MARÍA UGARTE DE BRUSLOFF. Publicación de la ley en Santo Domingo durante el período de la dominación española. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (Ciudad Trujillo), May.
- HUMBERTO R. CASTELLANOS. Labor y disciplina de los religiosos en la colonia. *Rev. Mus. Bib.*, Apr., 1943.
- LEOPOLDO MARTÍNEZ COSÍO. Ensayo sobre heráldica mexicana. *Mem. Acad. Mex. Hist.*, Oct.
- JEAN DELANGLEZ. El Río del Espíritu Santo [cont.]. *Mid-Am.*, Jan.

DOCUMENTS

- Cédula de nombramiento de Rodrigo Ponce de León, de gobernador de Honduras, en lugar de Alonso de Contreras Guevara [November 5, 1582]. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.*, Sept.
- Tributos para el Hospital Real de Indios [1587-1603]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), July.
- Catálogo de pobladores de Nueva España [1603-1607] [cont.]. *Ibid.*, Apr., July, 1943.
- Autos hechos en razón del breve de Su Santidad (8 de agosto de 1621) y cédula de Su Majestad (2 de febrero de 1622), presentados por el rector del Colegio de la Compañía de Jesús, en que pretende se den grados a los que cursen en la casa de estudios. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Gob.*, Sept.
- Autos hechos en razón de dar los grados de bachilleres, licenciados, maestros y doctores en artes y teología a los que cursan en cinco años en el Colegio de Santo Tomás, quedando transformado en universidad [1624-25]. *Ibid.*
- Autos seguidos en razón de que se puedan dar grados a los que cursaren artes y teología en el Colegio de la Compañía de Jesús [1626]. *Ibid.*
- Título de gobernador y capitán general en la Provincia de Honduras, a favor de D. Melchor Alonso Tamayo, en lugar del capitán D. Pedro Carrillo de Zayas [December 31, 1639] [concl.]. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.*, July.
- Título de gobernador y capitán general de la Provincia de Honduras a favor del capitán Pedro del Rosal en lugar del capitán Juan de Miranda. *Ibid.*, Nov.
- Autos acerca del otorgamiento de grados en el Colegio de la Compañía de Jesús [1640]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Gob.*, Sept.
- El deán doctor Ambrosio del Castillo Valdés solicita se rinda informe a su majestad, acerca de la conveniencia que en el Colegio de Santo Tomás, se otorguen grados menores y mayores.—23 de junio de 1640. *Ibid.*
- El maestro don Pedro de Cárcamo Valdés, es nombrado rector del Colegio de Santo Tomás de Aquino.—21 de marzo de 1646. *Ibid.*
- Un auto de fe en el siglo XVII (algunos datos desconocidos sobre este célebre suceso) [1649]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), Apr., 1943.
- Colección Lugo. Archivo General de Indias [1654] [cont.]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (Ciudad Trujillo), May.
- JOSÉ IGNACIO DÁVILA GARIBI. Prevenciones tomadas por el gobierno de la Nueva Galicia ante el temor de un ataque de los piratas ingleses a las costas del pacífico [1740]. *Mem. Acad. Mex. Hist.*, Oct.
- Expediente actuado por el señor brigadier don Pedro Salazar, gobernador y capitán general del Reyno de Guathemala y presidente de su real audiencia, sobre la expulsión de los religiosos de la Compañía de Jesús y su remisión a España [1767]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Gob.*, Sept.

Sobre exploraciones y fundaciones de la costa septentrional de las Californias en tiempo del Excmo. Sr. virrey don Martín de Mayorga. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), July.
 La nobleza colonial.—Último tercio del siglo XVIII [concl.]. *Ibid.*
 El Convento de la Concepción. *Ibid.*, Apr., 1943.

SPANISH SOUTH AMERICA

GERMANS IN THE CONQUEST OF AMERICA: A SIXTEENTH CENTURY VENTURE. By *Germán Arciniegas*. Translated by *Ángel Flores*. (New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. 217, \$2.50.) The clank of the conquistadores' armor has often drowned out the chink of the coin that was paid for some of the other ventures for discovering and exploiting sixteenth century Spanish America. Sr. Arciniegas here largely disregards the conquistadores. What interests him are the several undertakings by "Germans" who received grants from the Habsburgs, partly as concessions for colonization and exploitation and partly as security for loans to the Habsburg treasury. Unfortunately, the term "German" is confusing and distracts attention from what Sr. Arciniegas is interested in. By "Germans" he means capitalists, the Fuggers and Welsers and others, who made and lost money on fluctuations in the Habsburg fortunes. He dislikes them because they were mercenary and, the reader soon discovers, because they were not Spanish. They represented only arms and wealth, they were nothing but soldiers and bankers, they had no interest in the new lands except in the hope of profit, and their work was barren. The constructive work of founding permanent cities, establishing and nourishing colonies, and carrying the faith to the uttermost wilderness was done by Spaniards. Spanish America as we know it today is the descendant of those Spaniards and bears no impress of the profit-seeking "Germans." The thesis is not new and some of the literary sources on which it is based are among the classics of American history. Sr. Arciniegas' narrative of the struggles of Ehinger, Federmann, von Hutten, Schmidl, and others in the wilderness emphasizes the colorful and makes easy reading. For the economic background he draws on Ehrenberg, but, as indicated by the variety of meanings given "German," without following him closely. The book is one of a number now being translated in order to bring to readers in the United States the point of view of Latin Americans on things in general and their own history in particular. For this purpose, the present slight volume, chosen, it would seem, for its length and its adventitiously eye-catching title and subject matter, does not do Sr. Arciniegas justice. He has made genuine contributions to the historiography of his native Colombia, he possesses a mind that it is a pleasure to know, and readers who need not depend on translations will do well to explore his writings.

ALEXANDER MARCHANT

ALARDES Y DERRAMAS. DOCUMENTOS PARA LA HISTORIA DEL PERÚ. Edited by *Rafael Loredó*. (Lima, Gil, S. A., Impresores, pp. 134, paper.) The documents here published, with an elaborate introduction by the editor, throw much new light on the rebellion of Gonzalo Pizarro against the authority of the Spanish crown.

ARTICLES

AMANDO SCHEDL. El quipu peruano según Martín de Morúa. *Rev. Geog. Am.*, July.
 EMILIANO JOS. Centenario del Amazonas: La expedición de Orellana y sus problemas históricos [cont.]. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Jan.-Apr., 1943.
 CHARLES MAXWELL LANCASTER and PAUL THOMAS LANCASTER. Chile on the Warpath. *New Mexico Quar. Rev.*, Autumn.
 NICOLÁS FASOLINO ——— [archbishop of Santa Fe]. Ilmo. Sr. Doctor Tomás Vázquez de Liaño primer obispo que muere en Santa Fe. *Rev. Junta Est. Hist. Santa Fe*, May.

- CARLOS PEÑA OTAEGUI. Santiago en el siglo XVII. *Bol. Acad. Chilena Hist.*, Jan., 1943.
 ÁNGEL MARTÍN MORENO. La explotación en el valle del Supía en el siglo XVIII. *Rev. Indias* (Madrid), Jan., 1943.
 HERMANN TRIMBORN. Tres estudios para la etnografía y arqueología de Colombia [cont.]. *Ibid.*, Jan., Apr., 1943.
 ROBERTO MAC-LEAN y ESTENÓS. Sociología educacional peruana. Universidades, colegios, seminarios y escuelas en el Virreinato del Perú. *Rev. Mex. Soc.*, segundo trimestre, 1943.

DOCUMENTS

- Descripción corográfico-mixta de la Provincia de Guayana [1778]. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Caracas), Mar.
 Del estado y abono de fiadores en que estaban los subdelegados de la Intendencia de Mérida.—1809. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), July.

BRAZIL

ARTICLES

- J. MANUEL ESPINOSA. José de Anchieta: "Apostle of Brazil" [concl.]. *Mid-Am.*, Jan.
 D. LEE HAMILTON. A vida e as obras de José de Anchieta. *Hispania*, Dec.

NATIONAL PERIOD

MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

ARTICLES

- ALFONSO TEJA ZABRE. Morelos and His Political Achievements [reprinted from *Inter-America*, February, 1925]. *Mex. Rev.*, Summer.
 JORGE LARDÉ y LARÉN. La batalla de las Charcas (15 de marzo de 1829). *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.*, July.
 ESTEBAN GUARDIOLA. El general Francisco Morazán. Boceto bibliográfico escrito con motivo del primer centenario de la muerte de aquel preclaro repúblico. *Ibid.*, Oct.
Id. Morazán, pacifista. *Ibid.*
 OHLAND MORTON. Life of General Don Manuel de Mier y Terán [cont.]. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Jan.
 JOSÉ REINA VALENZUELA. D. Francisco Cruz y la Botica del Pueblo [cont.]. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.*, July, Aug., Sept., Oct., Nov.

DOCUMENTS

- MARTÍN ALVARADO. Nueve de junio [*partida de bautismo* of José Trinidad Cabañas, Tegucigalpa, July 9, 1805]. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.*, July.
 Documentos de la guerra de independencia. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), July.
 La anexión a México. Documentos y escritos de 1821-1822, publicados por Rafael Heliodoro Valle. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.*, July, Aug.
 Anales parlamentarios. Asamblea ordinaria del Estado de Honduras. Año, 1830. Actas Nos. 35 y 36. Actas Nos. 37, 38 y 39. *Ibid.*
 Costumbres de las indias de Yucatán, por el mayólogo D. Juan J. Hernández [1846]. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (México, D. F.), Apr., 1943.
 Sucesos relacionados con la expedición del Gral. Ricardo Streber al puerto de Omoa y con el bombardeo de la Fortaleza de San Fernando por la fragata inglesa "Niove," al mando de Sir Lambton Loraine, el 19 de agosto de 1873. *Rev. Arch. Bib. Nac.*, Aug., Sept., Oct., Nov.

CUBA, THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, AND HAITI

ARTICLES

- GERARDO BROWN CASTILLO. La sociedad cubana en 1831. *Rev. Mex. Soc.*, segundo trimestre, 1943.

DOCUMENTS

EMILIO RODRÍGUEZ DEMORIZI. Correspondencia del cónsul de Francia en Santo Domingo, 1844-1846. *Bol. Arch. Gen. Nac.* (Ciudad Trujillo), May.

SPANISH SOUTH AMERICA

EL CATECISMO POLÍTICO CRISTIANO. By *Ricardo Donoso*. (Santiago de Chile, Imprenta Universitaria, 1943, pp. 121, paper.) This essay presents the results of an exploration of contemporary writings of the generation preceding independence in Spanish America in an attempt to discover the pre-revolutionary climate of opinion in Spain's American empire.

ARTICLES

MARIANO PICÓN-SALAS. Vísperas de revolución. *Cuad. Am.*, Jan.

RICARDO PICCIRILLI. Bernardino Rivadavia. El 1.º de enero de 1809 y algunos hechos anteriores a la participación revolucionaria. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.

"UN PORTEÑO." Rivadavia [republished from *El Uruguay* of Entre Ríos, No. 238, October 18, 1857]. *Rev. Junta Est. Hist. Santa Fe*, May.

TOMÁS RUEDA VARGAS. Nariño. *Rev. Indias* (Bogotá), no. 55 (1943).

Id. Sucre. Ibid.

MIGUEL ANTONIO CARO. José Fernández Madrid (apuntes biográficos). *Ibid.*, no. 57 (1943).

RICARDO LEVENE. Historia filosófica de la revolución de mayo. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.

ANTONINO SALVADORES. Creación y extención de las juntas provinciales de 1811. *Ibid.*

JUAN A. SIDOTI. Tagle y la conjuración. *Ibid.*

LUIS VALENCIA AVARIA (ed.). Memorias íntimas de don Pedro Félix Vicuña Aguirre. *Bol. Acad. Chilena Hist.*, Jan., 1943.

FÉLIX G. BARRETO. El Dr. Manuel Leiva (1794-1879). *Rev. Junta Est. Hist. Santa Fe*, May.

ENRIQUE D. TOVAR Y R. Los protomártires de Quito: D. Nicolás de la Peña y doña Rosa Zárate (datos rectificatorios y apuntes sobre su descendencia). *Bol. Acad. Chilena Hist.*, Jan., 1943.

ANTONINO SALVADORES. El reglamento de Manuel Belgrano para las escuelas de Tarija, Jujuy, Tucumán y Santiago del Estero, del 25 de mayo de 1813. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.

NOTA DEL GRAL. Artigas al Muy Ilustre Cabildo de Santa Fe [no date]. *Rev. Junta Est. Hist. Santa Fe*, May.

BUENAVENTURA OTO. El federalismo en Córdoba. Sus constituciones federales (1821-1847). *Ibid.*

JUAN A. SIDOTI. Primeros rozamientos entre Córdoba y el congreso general constituyente. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.

Id. José Mármol político. *Ibid.*

ENRIQUE M. BARBA. Los jefes federales ante la separación de Jujuy 1834. *Ibid.*

HARVEY LEROY JOHNSON. Una contrata inédita, dos programas y noticias referentes al teatro en Bogotá entre 1838 y 1840. *Rev. Iberoam.*, Nov.

WALTER T. PHILLIPS. Chilean Customs in Blest Gana's [historical] Novels. *Hispania*, Dec.

J. FRED RIPPY. Dawn of the Railway Era in Colombia. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Nov.

CARLOS HERAS. El tratado del 20 de diciembre de 1854 entre la Confederación y el Estado de Buenos Aires. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.

CARLOS F. GARCÍA. La candidatura presidencial de don Mariano Fraguero en Buenos Aires. *Ibid.*

CARLOS HERAS. Repercusión del convenio de 6 de junio de 1860 en la provincia de Córdoba. *Ibid.*

ANDRÉS R. ALLENDE. La frontera norte de Buenos Aires y la fundación de Lincoln. *Ibid.*

MARCOS M. BLANCO. Historia del Colegio Nacional de la Plata. *Ibid.*

YSABEL FISK. Argentina: The Thirteen Year Crisis. *For. Affairs*, Jan.

DOCUMENTS

Estadística de la Provincia de Barinas en 1831. *Bol. Arch. Nac.* (Caracas), May.

ENRIQUE M. BARBA. Apéndice documental [concerning the separation of the province of Jujuy, 1832-36]. *Labor Centro Est. Hist.* (La Plata), 1942.

JUAN A. SIDOTTI. Apéndice documental [concerning Gregorio Tagle, 1833]. *Ibid.*

BRAZIL

REBELLION IN THE BACKLANDS. Translated from OS SERTÕES, by *Euclides da Cunha*, with Introduction and Notes by *Samuel Putnam*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1944, pp. xxxii, 526, \$5.00.) The present excellent translation makes available for the first time to English readers a work frequently termed "Brazil's greatest classic," first published in Rio de Janeiro in 1902. The author—soldier, engineer, and journalist—made the 1897 campaign of the Brazilian Republican Army against Canudos, back-country stronghold of the *sertanejos* of northern Brazil, stirred to religious frenzy by their messianic leader Antonio Conselheiro, the occasion for a unique analysis of the human and natural factors responsible not only for the revolt but for the characteristics of much of the vast Brazilian back-country. Though many of the author's scientific concepts, particularly in the field of anthropology, are false and badly outdated, the work, itself a historic document of prime importance, remains fundamental to an understanding of modern Brazil.

Carrying On

Echoes from New York

THE fifty-eighth annual meeting of the Association took place in New York at Milbank Hall, which Barnard College very kindly made available for a headquarters. The meeting lasted only two days, December 29 and 30. Sixteen sessions were held and thirty-one papers delivered. War teaching schedules and transportation difficulties kept the attendance down to a modest 290, for only members within reasonable traveling distance of New York were able to attend. Many familiar faces were absent, others appeared for but a moment in unfamiliar uniforms, and much of the attendant, informal social intercourse was prevented by the exigencies of war.

In holding such an emaciated shadow of former annual meetings the Council and the Committee on Program were motivated not by an obstinate desire to pretend business goes on as usual but rather by the conviction that members of the Association, or even that part of the membership living in and around New York City, have an obligation as scholars and as citizens to focus their knowledge on the problems arising out of the war. The general topic chosen for the program was postwar reconstruction. The pace of events during the last year has made it imperative that historians study earlier periods of reconstruction after victory in order that old mistakes be not repeated. It is the common fate of committees on program that all the papers cannot conceivably be made to follow the central theme; symmetry must be sacrificed to the variety and specialization of modern scholarship.

Yet in both formal and informal discussion, in spite of the pressure of other duties which plagued authors and the committee alike, the difficulties of the post-war world and the use of historical knowledge in their solution were both explored. Some of the sessions turned to past ages and previous wars for lessons in peacemaking, in military government, in economic reconstruction, or in the variety of adjustment which human institutions must make at such times. Others concerned themselves more with the specific task of the historian and his art. The Committee on the Teaching of American History in the Schools and Colleges made its report and recommended a more careful division of labor between grade school, high school, and college. Another session at least began an inquiry into the historical role of history as a liberal art and the new part it must play in any revitalized program of liberal studies.

The maintenance of peace in the ancient world was the concern of the ancient historians. J. A. O. Larsen analyzed, with a fine grasp of detail, the purpose, con-

stitution, and record of the leagues which, from the sixth to the second century B.C., endeavored to secure peace for the Greek city states. His essay-survey on "Federation for Peace in Ancient Greece" was primarily a story of failure, though the near success of the various experiments offered much food for thought. A paper by W. E. Caldwell opened the discussion with the argument that arbitration, which had succeeded on earlier occasions, often failed in the Peloponnesian War because the Athenian Empire was no more arbitrable than the British Empire. E. J. Bickerman continued the discussion by insisting that the Greek concept of peace was founded on two cornerstones, a treaty of peace to end the past and a pact of nonaggression setting up mutual obligations for the future. The general discussion centered around the real nature of the Greeks' conception of peace and the meaning of the idea of freedom.

The session on medieval history also concerned itself with the maintenance of peace. Anna Campbell's paper on "The Heretics and the Public Peace from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century" emphasized the dynamic effects of the heretics and the manner in which their revolt and the church's reaction to the revolt both contributed toward the development of modern constitutionalism and the protection of the individual in society. The second paper, "Peter Chelcicky, the Spiritual Father of the *Unitas Fratrum*," by Matthew Spinka, provided a case history of a reformer in many ways as important and in some ways more original in his radical Biblicism than John Huss. A pioneer in his insistence on separation of church and state and, to a lesser degree, in his pacifism, Chelcicky displayed a remarkable intellectual virility for one of his humble beginnings and, as Professor Spinka showed, was by no means a simple follower of Huss and the other reformers of his time. As the spiritual father of the Unity of Brethren, Peter Chelcicky has at last found his biographer.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Catholic Historical Association devoted its attention to the place of the church in postwar periods. A. Paul Levack offered a case in point with his very patient and acute analysis of the Catholic church in post-Napoleonic France. The plight of the church in the years after 1815 resulted from the revolutionary changes of the past thirty years. The nationalization of church lands and the change in the size of the church, the problem of restoring the Catholic cult to its former influence over society, and particularly the future of the Concordat of 1801 were all major problems. The disturbed relations with the papacy since 1808 and particularly the conflicts between the French church and the papacy over the abrogation or continuance of the Concordat made relations with Rome very complicated. In the discussion Geoffrey Bruun added two further elements to the picture: the fluctuations in the amounts of income which the crown was prepared to contribute to the clergy's support, which was closely linked up with the whole problem of the church's lands, and the historical problem of the papacy's attitude toward new governments born of revolution or defeat, a problem which Mr. Bruun pointed

out had never been fully explored. The Reverend Edward V. Cardinal continued the discussion by emphasizing the spiritual confusion which inevitably follows movements like the French Revolution, the *misère noire* of the clergy and the lack of leadership. In the general discussion the whole problem of separation of church and state was explored and the suggestion made that the American model, which dispenses with a concordat, might have something to offer.

In the joint session of the American Historical Association and the Economic History Association, H. M. Somers' historical analysis of "American Policies of Postwar Readjustment" was the basis of the session. Mr. Somers attempted to evaluate the postwar policy of the United States to the Civil War and the first World War, using as his criterion the high level of employment and business activity. After the Civil War the rapid demobilization of the Army and the sudden halt in war spending ignored the short-term economic effects of a return to peace and contributed to a postwar depression. Temporary wartime changes, particularly in the tariff and fiscal policies, were made permanent with noticeable effect. After the first World War, American experience was very much the same. Demobilization of the armed forces and contract termination both had a depressive effect; disposal of materials and plant, fiscal policy, and monetary policy were all, in the end, depressive. The tariff policy was largely neutral. The depression of 1920-21 resulted, in part, from the drop in purchasing power and the failure to create new purchasing power. Arguing from America's historical past, Mr. Somers concluded that it is essential to realize during the war that postwar economy must be launched on its way as well as the control of demobilization, the termination of war contracts, and the continuation in general of wartime controls. There is "no point in bringing on a depression in order to prevent a boom." In the discussion C. W. Cole and J. M. Clark both emphasized the danger of arguing from historical analogy. The latter pointed out that the size of the present war, its demands on the national income, and the very real prospect of its ending not at one time but in installments all made it *sui generis* and underline the need of continuing economic controls. Mr. Clark prophesied that our major problems would come in the decade after the immediate postwar period. Mr. Cole re-emphasized the peculiarities of the present conflict, the possibilities of extended military occupations overseas, the tax refunds and corporate reserves which are being built up for the postwar period, the comparative success of price control which must not be lost at the close of hostilities, and the peculiar impact of foreign conditions on our economy.

The underlying complexities of tenancy and tenure occupied the attention of the American Historical Association and the Agricultural History Society. The unique and distinctive characteristics of New York's land system were brought out by David Maldwyn Ellis in his paper on "Land Tenure and Tenancy in the Hudson Valley, 1790-1860." The tenant farmers of the Hudson Valley were victims of an almost feudal system of overlordship as well as participants in the

revolutionary changes in rural economy resulting from the growth of the home market and the flood of Western produce. Resentment crystallized throughout the leasehold region in the antirent agitation of the period 1839-45 and resulted in the disappearance of an institution which had outlived its usefulness. LaWanda Cox, in asking the question "Tenancy: A Step toward Farm Ownership?" challenged the widely accepted hypothesis that the agricultural ladder was the dominant and most significant pattern in the agricultural life of America during the period between the close of the Civil War and the opening of the twentieth century. Her arguments were drawn not only from the cotton plantations and the freedmen of the South but also from the period of falling prices and hard times in the corn and wheat states and from the very limited statistics on progress from tenant to owner in those areas. The institution of tenancy was growing and must be studied in this light.

Ray A. Billington's analysis of "The Origins of Middle Western Isolationism" provoked a lively inquiry into one of the major phenomena of twentieth century politics. Why did the Middle West, which led the nation into the War of 1812, become the twentieth century heart of American isolationism? On examining that section's reaction to some of the crises in nineteenth century foreign relations and the reversal of this earlier position sometime after 1900, Mr. Billington found two explanations, both deriving from the failure of the silver crusade: the agrarians of the Midwest became so distrustful after this triumph of Eastern capitalism that they automatically opposed any policy backed by the East, and the businessmen of the Middle West were terrified by the silver bogey into such blind Republican partisanship that any Democratic President was automatically suspect.

Mr. Julius Pratt opened the discussion by insisting on a definition of terms. "Isolationist" and "interventionist" suggested deviations from a normal course; the early leaders of the republic, particularly Monroe, defined the latter as aloofness in matters relating strictly to Europe and active protection of American interests whenever they were "invaded or seriously menaced." Qualifying Mr. Billington's analysis, Mr. Pratt considered that the Middle West followed the normal pattern most of the time, deviating occasionally on the interventionist side. To explain the shift after 1900, Mr. Pratt felt that the growing Anglophobia of the section and its trust in the protection afforded by geography should also be included. In continuing the discussion Carlton C. Qualey insisted on a definition of the term Middle West in time and in place. Also the influence of immigrant nationality groups on American foreign policy required investigation.

The session on peacemaking explored past experience in this problem in an attempt to discover what lessons the historian and his hindsight might unearth. Gordon Craig analyzed the "Technique of Peacemaking" with this end in view. The seventeenth and eighteenth century use of a general European congress to end wars had suffered from a lack of preparation and from a multiplicity of questions to solve, which combined to drag out the congress interminably. Aware of

this, the statesmen of Vienna avoided a general congress and broke the procedure down into a peace treaty, a preliminary agreement between the great powers on territorial redistribution, and a final congress merely for ratification. Although the preliminary preparations were insufficient, particularly with regard to the role of the smaller powers, Vienna did separate the problem of the peace from that of establishing the new order. Versailles tended unfortunately to ignore the practice of the past and Wilson, by insisting on the incorporation of the League in the treaty, fatally intermingled once more the peace and the plans for the postwar world. To Mr. Craig this past experience demonstrated not so much any general principles of peacemaking but rather some pitfalls to be avoided; preliminary co-ordinating organization, probably military in nature, must be set up; agreement in detail is quite as important as agreement in principle; peace and reconstruction must certainly precede, but not delay, the establishment of the new order.

Admitting his debt to the hindsight of history, Thomas A. Bailey in the second paper of the session attempted to list Wilson's mistakes or blunders. Disregarding the general misfortune that overtook the settlement, Mr. Bailey listed twenty-one instances where history would seem to prove Wilson wrong. Some were errors of omission, concerned particularly with the President's failure or inability to educate American public opinion for the new responsibilities or to keep it abreast of developments at Paris. Others were more sins of commission, errors in tactics as they now appear to have been: the premature forcing of a republic on Germany, the appeal in October, 1918, for a Democratic congress, the ignoring of the Republicans in the American delegation, the sabotage of the idea of a preliminary treaty, Wilson's general hope that mankind could obtain the millennium in one bound. Conscious of his insistence on the debit side of the ledger, Mr. Bailey reminded the session that Wilson did head off a great many shortsighted punitive measures and did redeem his original Fourteen Points as far as conditions would permit. The discussion mainly concerned itself with some of the controversial positions in the two provocative papers.

The session on military government began with Ralph Gabriel's paper on "American Theories of Military Government." A variety of missions, from the Mexican War of 1846 to the Philippines or Sicily, has resulted in a variety of form in American military governments. Strategic and tactical situations, the mission or purpose of the particular undertaking, and the culture of the people to be governed inevitably made each experience a unique enterprise. Mr. Gabriel, however, saw one constant factor at work which has determined since 1846 the over-all character of American military government. The American understanding of the laws of war and of international law, derived originally in part from the democratic and humanitarian sentiments of mid-nineteenth century America, set the limits of military power and the tone for the supervision of civil affairs and kept America from a harsh *realpolitik* in military government. Scott's General Order 20 and General Order 100 in the Civil War are milestones in this development.

In criticizing the paper, A. C. Davidonis questioned whether this peculiar development of American military government has been due entirely to the dispensations of the American democratic spirit. Chance and other impersonal factors have also had a hand. Most American wars have been short and easy victories where hard feelings had little time to develop; the one exception, the Civil War, demonstrated the precarious nature of democratic humanitarianism amid the rigors of congressional reconstruction. With a general, welcome absence of national feelings, American policy could follow democratic lines more easily than European countries. Usually the American troops have entered as liberators, a fortunate role; our experience in the Philippines showed the other parts in the cast to be more difficult. Mr. Davidonis' criticism argued that American military government in the past had been the result of luck as well as of design.

The joint meetings of the Association, the Conference on Latin American History, and the History of Science Society dispelled the popular misconception that intellectual activity in Latin America was stagnant or declining in the centuries following the original settlements. C. A. Browne showed that Alexander von Humboldt, the naturalist and explorer, was much impressed with the interest and accomplishments of both the aborigines and the European settlers in pure and applied science. His travels in Latin America between 1799 and 1804 convinced him of the enthusiasm and knowledge displayed in the fine work of the Mexican School of Mines and in the practical ingenuity shown in the native manufacture of the poison *curare*. Humboldt's observations provide a fund of information on the state of learning in Latin America and even when incorrect testify to the range and universality of his own interests. Louis C. Karpinski illustrated by means of his survey of mathematical works published in America the antiquity of mathematical studies in Latin America. The first chair in mathematics in the New World was established at the University of Mexico in 1637, and activity in the field was thereafter continuous, with particular emphasis on mathematics as applied to the needs of commerce or the schools. The particular importance of learned societies in Latin America was illustrated by Arthur P. Whitaker. Established in the eighteenth century in the characteristic pattern of the enlightenment, the early societies were broad in interest, aware of their social as well as their intellectual obligations. The alternations of reaction and reform in the early nineteenth century served to divest most of them of their political purpose and accelerate their development as learned societies. Becoming progressively less encyclopedic and more technical or professional in keeping with the increasing complexity of their subject matter and the greater contact with the rest of the world, these societies have persisted down to the present time.

The two papers read at the joint luncheon of the Association and the Society of American Archivists both stressed the need for public and official understanding of the importance of archives. Oliver W. Holmes emphasized the co-operation necessary between municipal, state, and Federal authorities in the preservation of records, particularly where their activities and records overlap. The Federal

government has surveyed its needs in the New York area with regard to the preservation both of the great accumulations in the older agencies and of the more temporary materials in war agencies. In view of the interdependence of all such records a co-operative Federal-state-municipal archives center should certainly be considered. Miss Rankin surveyed the generally neglected state of New York City's vast accumulation of records, showing how their preservation became nobody's business because by law it was necessarily everybody's business. This led eventually to a mayor's investigating committee in 1939 and the establishment in 1941 of a municipal records building whose growth and expansion to handle all the municipal records safely and efficiently under one roof is awaiting the conclusion of the war.

An encouraging picture of the foresight and planning directed at the chronicling of American military effort in the present war was provided in the session on the historical sections of the Army. Robert R. Palmer described the origin, personnel, policy, and accomplishments of the Historical Section of the Army Ground Forces. Staffed by professional historians under the direction of Major Kent Greenfield, the section has occupied itself with the chronicling of problems and policies of the ground forces within the United States; overseas forces have their own historians. Any factors which might be of practical assistance in the future are recorded. The section has the double problem common to all similar groups of not only keeping a running file of events as they happen but also of at least beginning the task of writing a narrative history. The Historical Branch G-2 of the General Staff, as W. L. Wright explained, has similar aims. Established by the same directive which required the appointment of historical officers to record the administrative activities of their respective headquarters, the historical branch is now writing immediate, narrative accounts of operations in the field through the dispatching of competent historians to the various theaters of operations. Eventually it hopes to publish documents and an official history.

Lieutenant Colonel Clanton W. Williams explained a similar desire of the Army Air Forces to record its history "while it is hot" and save itself from relying again for the story of what happened on the memories of men who served twenty-five years before. A considerable organization has been set up and the administrative history branch is well under way; every unit of importance has a historical officer conserving and forwarding his records. The problem of the historian in the Army Service Forces, as outlined by Lieutenant Colonel J. D. Millet, is complicated by the fact that service force activities are so varied that selection and choice must be practiced by the historian from the very start. The most the historian can do is to synthesize and analyze in the hope that he is not leaving out too much. A comprehensive report of work of the Army Service Forces is the modest aim of their historians.

The great interest aroused by the controversy was reflected in the lively session on the report of the Committee on the Teaching of American History in the

Schools and Colleges. The report is now available in printed form (Edgar B. Wesley, *American History in Schools and Colleges* [Macmillan, 1943], \$1.00) and should be read by all historians concerned with the obligations of their craft. Its findings will only be incidentally summarized here. The director of the committee, Edgar B. Wesley, first described the report and its recommendations. As the inquiry grew out of discussion in the *New York Times* and later in Congress over the supposed ignorance among Americans of their own history, the report first applied itself to this problem. The results of the test administered by the committee to various representative groups confirmed the *Times'* conclusions that most people have forgotten, if they ever knew, a great many facts about United States history. The test also showed, however, that most people do know a reasonable amount of the functional, interpretative history of their country. Furthermore, most students are subjected to American history from three to five separate times during school and college, and there is no real lack of history courses. What is needed is intelligent, systematic gradation of materials and content in history courses from elementary school through college in order that unnecessary and boring duplication be avoided. More rigid requirements for teaching of American history but no legal requirements for courses or their contents by legislatures were also recommended.

In opening the discussion, A. T. Volwiler commented on the timeliness of the report and its general value but criticized the involved and occasionally abstruse nature of the committee's test. He also hoped that the committee did not mean to infer, in the discussion of the relationship between research and teaching, that research necessarily means poor teaching. Though the report was both progressive and practical, Dr. Volwiler felt that it perhaps had not gone far enough in the direction of functional history to satisfy the progressive schools. Yet he felt that the report possibly underestimated the basic importance of factual learning which is so essential for sound interpretation and true understanding.

The general discussion revolved around the means of implementing the recommendation of the committee and, particularly, of stimulating teachers to follow it and schools and colleges to work out the necessary degree of co-operation. Some felt that the report had been too mild in its reply to the *Times*, considering the blow dealt by the latter's findings to the morale of teachers and to the general standing of the teachers and their subject with the general public.

The obligations of the historian in the postwar world were perhaps most widely investigated in the session on history and the liberal arts. The very nature of the meeting was a challenge to intellectual and geographic provincialism. The presiding officer was a professor of English literature, the first speaker a philosopher, the second a historian of ideas, and the third a historian in exile from prostrate Poland. Theodore E. Greene first examined the nature and function of the liberal arts, all those disciples of liberalizing, humanizing effect which contribute to a respect for human nature or devotion to the ideal of human liberty.

Of recent years the danger in such studies has been overspecialization, almost a balkanization of knowledge, which ignored the whole for the parts. Dr. Greene invited history to join philosophy in reintroducing the necessary integration and synthesis. The ambiguous nature of history as both an art and a science, its concern at once with both the unique and the universal, its value as a balance to provincialism, as a spotlight out of the past into the future, fitted it for such a partnership in scholarship as well as in the teaching of the liberal arts.

Speaking on "History as a Liberal Art," Jacques Barzun sought in the development of the art of history the answer to his question. The rebirth of history in the late eighteenth century, the enlargement and advance in history writing represented by Voltaire's *Essai sur les mœurs* when compared with the works of the venerable Bede, all showed the breadth and scope of the historian's real purpose, his design to impart understanding, to enrich the student's mind rather than teach him just to classify or dismiss facts, to relate in a comprehensible fashion the past and the present. In some practical, stimulating recommendations, Dr. Barzun went on to suggest how this end might be attained. History teaching must be organized and integrated; a thorough grounding in the intellectual and institutional development of the modern world, beginning at some arbitrary date in the past, would be preferable to a larger but more superficial survey. The other subjects in the curriculum—science, literature, the fine arts, philosophy—must be assisted in the proper treatment of their subjects historically, with the emphasis again on understanding, on the verifiable environment of a movement rather than a catalogue of facts. And finally the historians must not neglect or leave to inexperienced hands the task of making popular their findings. As custodians in part of the human imagination the historian has a duty both as a guide on traveled roads and as a trail blazer for new paths.

In a spirited plea for universality of outlook and impartiality in method, Oscar Halecki outlined the "Tasks of Historical Scholarship in the Postwar Period." The destruction of materials, the excessive limitation of history to contemporary events, the danger of particular, national interpretations of critical events are all threats to the integrity and the usefulness of history in the postwar period. Only by reviving the international organizations for effective co-operation between historians which had grown up since 1918 and by reaffirming a dynamic philosophy of history can the historians meet their responsibilities.

The annual dinner took place on Wednesday evening in the Columbia Faculty Club, 117th Street and Morningside Drive. Professor John A. Krout, chairman of the department of history in Columbia, presided. His first duty was to announce the following award of prizes: to Arthur M. Cook of Temple University, the George Louis Beer Prize for his study *British Enterprise in Nigeria*; to Harold Whitman Bradley of Stanford University, the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Prize for his volume entitled *The American Frontier in Hawaii: The Pioneers, 1789-1843*. He then introduced the President of the Association, Miss Nellie

Neilson of Mount Holyoke. Professor Krout's introduction was so appropriate and so happily phrased that it is here given in full:

"At the beginning of its sixtieth year the American Historical Association holds its fifth consecutive annual meeting in the lengthening shadows of a world at war. Here on Morningside Heights the naval training programs and other phases of the war effort go forward with no interruption. Some of you in coming across 116th Street may have found yourselves involuntarily falling into step with a platoon of marching midshipmen. Our classrooms and laboratories, as at other colleges and universities, are filled with men and women in the various military services. But if the university seems to be very busy at the moment with concerns which are not precisely those of the historian, it hopes that you will realize that its welcome is nonetheless cordial and sincere and that it looks forward with confidence to the day (not too far distant) when it may act as host to the entire membership of the Association.

"Even with a drastically abbreviated program and the omission of many traditional features of these annual meetings, the Executive Committee believed that our purposes could be forwarded this year. It was probably mindful of Herbert Baxter Adams' wise comment: 'The best results of a scientific convention are sometimes reached in conversational ways.' There is, to be sure, no rationing which impedes the free exchange of ideas among us.

"In this year 1943 the Association both celebrates an important anniversary and shatters a long-standing precedent. Fifty years ago the annual meeting was not held in December, but in July, in order that the two-day sessions might coincide with the World Historical Congress, sponsored by the Columbian Exposition in Chicago.¹ On July 12 a professor of American history from the University of Wisconsin, who looked even younger than his thirty-two years, read a paper entitled 'The Significance of the Frontier in American History.' It would be interesting to know how many of the forty-nine members who signed the registration book at the time appreciated how far-reaching would be the influence of Professor Turner's words on the writers of American history. Certainly few of them thought that a half century later his thesis would still command the respectful attention, as Professor Pierson has so cogently demonstrated, of most of the historians interested in the development of the American nation. The report of the proceedings at Chicago seemed to place chief emphasis on a paper which discussed the origin of Virginia's House of Burgesses; while the correspondent for the *Dial* dismissed the meeting with the remark that "sensational theorists" had no place on the program. Even after the "Frontier" essay had been twice published, its Eastern readers could still describe it as an interesting but curious

¹ In 1893 and in the years preceding and immediately following, attending members signed a register. This has been kept and the roll for the meeting in July, 1893, is here reproduced. That these records of attendance were not always complete is attested, we surmise, by the absence of the name of J. Franklin Jameson. Of those present and registered in 1893 only Frederic Bancroft is known to be living. [Editor's note.]

Ninth Annual Meeting
of the
American Historical Association

[July 11-13 1893 Chicago]

37

Name	Address in
H. B. Adams	Chicago
Wm. D. Cabell	Great Northern
Robert C. Houghton	Washington D C
Charles B. Elliott	Camille N.Y.
William H. Foster	Minneapolis Minn
Bernard Moore	Geneva Ill
W. W. Howe	University of Chicago Chicago, Ill.
J. J. Halsey	Newark and
William Henry Smith	Lake Forest Ill
A. A. Knicker	Lake Forest Ill
J. Fletcher Williams	New York City
Perce D. Shepard	Evansville.
W. P. French	Great Northern
James Amberton	Hotel Windsor
John Moses	Chicago 167 Ave. St
Cyrus W. Hodgin	29 Aldine Square
Mary Webster Adams	Dubuque Iowa
Lyke Reed	Grinnell Iowa
Edmund M. Barton	Worcester, Mass
Simon E. Baldwin	Newark Conn. G. Conn
Mrs. Frank B. Orr	Chicago, Ill
John Martin Vincent	University of Chicago
Frank W. Blackbeard	" "
George Kriebner	3410 Rhodes av.
Henry H. Holt	Tremont House
S. F. Parker	Hotel Geneva
Ellen Hardie Walworth	Northern Hotel

REGISTER FOR THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN

Ninth Annual Meeting of the 39 American Historical Association.

[July 11-13, 1893 - Chicago]

Name	Address in
Sney M. Salmon	Chicago, Chicago.
Mary Emma	University of
Frederic Turner	53d and Ellis
Wm. Black	Madison, Wis.
James A. Woodburn, Ind. Univ.	Hyde Park Hotel
Edw. H. Banne	6818 Wright St. Englewood
Edw. H. Banne	Univ. of Chicago
Wm. Stuart Worcester Mass	" " "
M. Louis Green	Providence R.I.
Edwin E. Sparks.	State College, Pa.
James Alva Hilgus	Ohio State Univ. Columbus O.
Fred Morrow Flinn	State Univ. Nebraska.
Wm. Wint Henry	Richmond Va. Great Northern
L. H. Boutwell	Chicago - 29 Putnam Block
C. C. Baldwin	Cleveland, O.
Pres. Water Reserve Hist. Soc.	3
Laura Osborne Talbot	Washington D.C.
Frederic Bancroft	Meash. D.C.
Isaac Abbot	State University of Iowa
Reuben G. Thwaites	Wis. Hist. Soc.
Charles H. Watkins	University of Wisconsin
Arthur. Yager	Georgetown College (Ky.)
William F. Follen	Chicago
Emma F. Follen	University of Chicago

HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION IN CHICAGO, JULY, 1893

and very provincial point of view. There were letters of praise, however, from John Fiske and Justin Winsor, which inspired Turner's later quip that at long last he could 'have faith in Massachusetts.'

"And that faith was not only in the Massachusetts of Harvard and Amherst and Williams but also in the Massachusetts of Mount Holyoke and Wellesley and Smith. My own most vivid recollection of Professor Turner calls up a conversation in which his eyes brightened with pleasure when he insisted that the founding fathers, needing a history of the Revolutionary struggle that would be at once realistic and powerful, turned to Mercy Otis Warren to supply what their own pens had failed to achieve. He would have applauded the decision of this Association in choosing, for its present leader, one who has nobly refuted the sharp dictum of testy John Adams that 'History is not the province of the Ladies.' At Bryn Mawr and at Mount Holyoke, in England and in America, her work is known for her rare gifts of combining the large view with the small one, of supporting the general concept with the minute examination of particulars, of illuminating great industry by knowing the goals toward which her task is leading.

"It would be presumptuous for me to introduce Miss Neilson to this company. Rather may I present to her this representative group from the membership of the Association. We who have followed her along interesting paths which run through England's medieval economy will find it no less intriguing to accompany her on her intellectual adventures with the early pattern of the common law.

"Ladies and gentlemen: The President of the American Historical Association."

Miss Neilson's address (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLIX, 199) is a summation of scholarship that will stand as a contribution to the literature of its field.

Yale University

THOMAS C. MENDENHALL

The Year's Business

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR FOR THE YEAR 1943

This year, instead of indulging in the split personality where your executive officer reports as editor to himself as secretary, I shall present a report reflecting the pattern of business in a unified office. The effectiveness of the plan proposed by the Committee of Ten on Reorganization has, I think, realized the hopes of the Association in adopting it. The economies and the smoothness with which it has worked are due in large part to the devoted and unstinted service given by the three women who carry the main burden of the Washington office: Miss Patty Washington, who has served the Association as assistant secretary-treasurer for many years; Miss Margaret Blegen, the assistant editor of the *Review*; and Miss Harriet Bohning, secretary and chief clerk. The resignation of the latter, effective at the close of this meeting, is a real loss. She will be succeeded by Miss Joan Margo, a graduate of Stanford University.

In many ways it was fortunate that the centralization of responsibilities in one

office came when it did. The war has made impossible meetings of the Council, of the Board of Editors, and even of the Executive Committee, whose one meeting this year for Association business was an adjunct of the emergency session called to consider a request of the Secretary of War and the Morale Branch of the Army of which you will hear more later. I can, however, say that through correspondence I have endeavored to keep in touch with those who in other circumstances would have shared more actively in the management and planning. Wherever their advice or aid has been sought, it has been freely and promptly given. This and the many manifestations of interest on the part of the membership who have written or dropped into the Washington office have served to keep me from wondering who really was the American Historical Association. It is to be hoped that this interest will continue, that it will manifest itself whenever possible, and at the close of the emergency find new and more vigorous methods of manifesting itself in the promotion of historical scholarship, teaching, and publication. If it fails to do this during and after the war, it will have missed a great opportunity. There is much talk of what science is doing and will do and of its importance in the nation's life. Let all this be granted, but the supremely important thing for a nation as for an individual is to know itself and to know itself in relation to all the past that is its heritage and in relation to all the peoples and nations who share with it the burdens and rewards of a common culture and the mutual responsibility for its preservation, its development, and its diffusion. In that very large and inescapable task, history widely conceived and the historian uplifted in the conception of his central place are the chief forces to keep America the last best hope of man.

In speaking thus of what may be, I am equally conscious of what is happening to historical scholarship here and abroad. The damages, the inroads, the losses, the slowing pulsation of intellectual life are evident in all the humanities, and it is only the profoundest faith born of watching mankind's upward path from the Stone Age that can keep alive the faith that out of the present travail man's spirit will survive to build on the ruins something nearer to his heart's desire. If we historians are to be any guide or help to the young men and women who survive and return to rebuild, we must be doubly sure that our sense of values helps them to build into their world only the soundest that should be preserved from the past. Unless through the teaching of history the intimate relation and value of liberty and law for each individual is made vividly personal, then all charters of new freedoms will become museum pieces and the vision of the century of the common man will recede more centuries into the future than stretch between us and Piers the Plowman or the Sermon on the Mount. There are in truth no new freedoms to be proclaimed. There are but old ones oft proclaimed and for millions unrealized. If they seem new to this generation in America, it is because our teaching has not made clear to our pupils the deeper meaning of our own past and the tested prophets of its future.

This report must, however, concern itself with the affairs of the Association

and the activities of the historical guild. As for the general status of the Association it may, I think, be called satisfactory, surprisingly so, all things considered. The membership on December 15 was two more than a year ago. More new members have been taken in this year than last year, including two life members as against a lost by death of seven in this class. Two of the seven were former Presidents of the Association, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart and Professor Charles M. Andrews. Such losses as there have been from inevitable causes have been overcome by a successful letter campaign in October, directed from the Washington offices. Expenditures have been kept to essentials. The only unbudgeted expenditure was the contribution of \$600 to the expenses of the Committee on the Teaching of American History in the Schools and Colleges. A certain part of that will come back through the Association's one third share in royalties from the sale of the report. Otherwise the funds on hand would fall but little below a year ago. We are a highly solvent group with undiminished material assets and increased intangibles in the tested and proved loyalty of our membership.

The membership statistics are as follows:

Individuals	
Life	441 ²
Annual	2744
Institutions	
25-year memberships	6
Annual	394
	<hr/>
Total	3585

As the time approached to write this report, at least three things occurred to me, any one of which might be raised for major consideration. The first was the above-mentioned report on the teaching of American history. With the availability of the report under the imprint of the Macmillan Company as a subject for one of our sessions, that no longer seems necessary. Whatever the results, and it is to be hoped they will be considerable, they are to the credit of a committee that took its responsibilities seriously, composed its differences in friendly forthright discussion, and profited by the able and energetic leadership of its director, Professor Edgar B. Wesley. One result might well be a standing committee of this Association on the college teaching of history and the training in colleges and graduate schools of teachers of history at the college and secondary school levels. Individual institutions and their faculties should be encouraged to form similar committees drawing their membership not from the history department alone but also from cognate and interested departments. The lack of such co-operation in teacher-training institutions, and all colleges and universities are teacher-training institutions, is one of the chief basic weaknesses revealed by the report.

² Of the two life members added, one is a new member and one an annual member who changed over to life membership.

A second topic for possible consideration was the status of projects for writing the history of the American effort in this war and the immediate effects of the war on the life of the nation. Contact with activities in this line in a center where every agency of the government, both old line and new, is history conscious, from the chief executive down, made that seem a logical and pertinent topic. It is, however, well covered in an account prepared co-operatively and published in the January issue of the *American Historical Review*.

The third possible topic was the Historical Service Board, set up with Dr. Theodore C. Blegen as director to prepare for the War Department discussion materials on public questions. These pamphlets are to be available for use on a voluntary basis by the armed forces in camps here and abroad. It has seemed more fitting to have Dean Blegen report orally to the Association, and a summary of his report will be embodied in the printed report of your Executive Secretary.

Having disposed of these three things by putting the labor on somebody else, as a good executive should, I am free to say something as Managing Editor of the *American Historical Review*. Here again I may gracefully side-step by pointing out, as all editors of learned journals do, that the issues of the *Review* and its contributors and reviewers have already spoken for themselves to all who read them, and I sincerely hope that even in its recent format the *Review* has not become a center table ornament. The detailed report which will be embodied in the printed report shows the normal inflow and output of articles and reviews. Volume XLVIII of the *Review* (October, 1942-July, 1943) contained 946 pages, including an annual index of 45 pages, as compared with 1,021 pages in Volume XLVII. The total number of articles, notes and suggestions, and documents was 16, as compared with 20 in Volume XLVII. Volume XLVIII contains 306 reviews as against 301 in Volume XLVII and 242 notices as against 336, a total of reviews and notices of 548 as compared with 637 in Volume XLVII, a decrease of approximately 14 per cent. During the period September 1, 1942-September 1, 1943, 80 articles, notes and suggestions, and documents were submitted. Of these 14 were accepted, 62 declined, and 4 are under consideration. Twelve major articles were published, including the presidential address and the report of the Executive Secretary on the progress of the Association during the past year. Of these (exclusive of the report on the Association) five were in the field of American history, three in European history, two in medieval history, and one on the Arab states. Of the notes and suggestions, one treated the collection of World War I materials in the individual states of the United States; another dealt with liberty poems in the Middle Ages; and a third was in the field of European history. There was one documentary contribution, on Russian opinion on the cession of Alaska to the United States. Again, as in the past, I want to point out that the disproportion between articles declined and those accepted is deceptive. No one should infer that it is hopeless to submit articles when so many are rejected. They would be comforted and encouraged if they knew that everything that comes in is recorded, in-

cluding a considerable miscellany of trivialities from people who could not make the home-town weekly—or perhaps only that. Such contributions come from other countries as well as the United States, and in some cases from people who know the *Review* only by name, and that not very accurately. Another discount percentage can be subtracted from the so-called rejections in the case of worthy and substantial articles whose authors are encouraged to submit them to a more appropriate medium and thus reach an audience more certain to be interested in the paper and the author. It is a satisfaction to see the appearance elsewhere of such scholarship. It is equally satisfactory when, with the aid of criticisms or suggestions from members of the Board of Editors or referees who are familiar with the field, a writer reworks his contribution into a form that does credit to himself and his material. In general the inflow of acceptable material has enabled the *Review* to present in its contents the scholarship and interest and distribution of articles by fields that characterized it in peacetime. I have heard tell of a time when there were on hand accepted articles for two years ahead. I also remember how in the last war Dr. Jameson talked of scraping the bottom of the barrel and not being certain of his contents from issue to issue. I do not hope to be editorially in the *dolce far niente* state represented by articles for two years ahead. Indeed, I would be unhappy to be in that plight, or if I were not the contributors who expect immediate publication and reprints the next day would do their best to make me unhappy. Even less do I want to scrape the barrel. The Managing Editor and the Board of Editors cannot conceal from themselves the evident effects on the flow of articles, of books worthy of review, and of available reviewers in special fields produced by the induction into the war effort of historians and the heavy burdens put upon staffs in essential war service teaching on campuses. We are all enlisted in the war effort whether in uniform or not. We are also equally pledged as scholars and citizens to maintain all those scholarly and cultural interests that give meaning to our objectives in the struggle. We must and will carry on as scholars and teachers, and there is encouragement to the belief that we are not losing our sense of abiding values in the fact that the over-all figure for articles received is only two below last year. The decline in books not of the temporary character produced in a flood by a war which is global can be and has been balanced by the space available for longer reviews of books having a claim to permanence in the historical literature of their special fields.

I am again happy to have an opportunity to record for the Board and myself our appreciation of all the co-operation we have received. There are occasional lighter touches that cheer the office force. One we treasure, and that I should like to share with you, is the rhymed response of a reviewer in answer to a reminder by Miss Blegen of a belated review. Please note that it has some pertinent reflections on reviewing in general. Here it is:

Washington, D. C.

Dear Miss Editress:

A review of a book is something to look for with pleasure, if written with care,
With a touch sure and deft, and not wholly bereft of humor and savoir-faire—
Especially if it omits soporific detail and a count of misprints,
Little errors of style, or of type, or a file of citations left out, with dark hints
That the failure to mention some antique recension betrays a deplorable hack.
A proper critique, not excessively meek, should aim at a higher approach,
With a balanced design to praise what is fine and condemn what deserves a
reproach,

To explain, not deride, what the author has tried to accomplish; and if he has
failed

It's hardly a crime for which to serve time—he probably shouldn't be jailed.

But it's rather a chore, as I've told you before, to dash off a trenchant review
Of a meaty, fat tome when you're far from your home and your study, with only
a few

Of your reference works on the Greeks and the Turks, on history, science, and art
On a shelf by your side to serve as your guide (they're a help when you want to
be smart).

It's a nuisance, I say, when you've finished your day at the office, gone home to
your flat

(In a hot jolting bus in a crowd sure to muss your clothes and your shoes and
your hat)

To relax for a while and cool off your bile with nothing to worry your mind,
And recall with chagrin it's high time to begin that review you should have
declined

To write, if you'd had the gumption; it's sad to be caught in so sorry a mess.
That's now my bad luck; I wish I could duck and escape from this painful distress.

But since a stern boss has declared it's impossible now to go back on my word,
I must struggle and strive, do my best to contrive a review that will not seem absurd
To the editor's minx who will pounce like a linx, if she finds any errors of fact.
It behooves me, therefore, to keep track of the score and write with a great deal
of tact.

So I'll light up my pipe and turn to my typewriter, ready to rattle the keys
In a fierce burst of speed with the hope of succeeding in drafting a text that will
please.

But I have no machine, and I fear that will mean I must write in my copperplate
script—

Now don't take it amiss, if I miss, Little Miss, dotting i's, crossing t's, if I've
slipped.

Here it's finished at last and my troubles are past, thank the Lord, though I'm
still in a spot;

For my face may be slapped, my review may be scrapped, I myself may be sen-
tenced and shot.

In fear and trembling
Yours faithfully
THE REVIEWER

What might have been left in the files as a pleasantry is worth recording not as poetry but as something so purely American amid the austerities of editorship and learning and the burdens of war that it helps explain why Americans are hard to define and understand even when analyzed in presidential addresses.

Before passing to a summary of committee reports I am saying for the Council and the Association what is usually put in some formal resolution, namely, that we are grateful to Barnard College and its administration and to Columbia University for their generous hospitality. We are more than appreciative of what has been done by Dr. Paul Beik of Columbia, who has singlehanded been a whole local arrangements committee backed by his colleagues, and grateful to Professor Joseph Strayer of Princeton, who set up a program faster than it could crumble away and came through amid great difficulties with a satisfactory program. If we have been able to carry on through the difficulties of the year and the difficulties of holding this meeting, it constitutes a good augury for the coming year and for the meeting in Chicago in 1944.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary*

For the record I am submitting summaries of the reports of the various committees.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AMERICANA FOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES

According to the plan the purpose of this committee was to assist institutions in the purchase of rare source books on American history, and the committee offered to appropriate \$500 annually for each of certain colleges for such purpose, providing the college itself appropriated an equal amount. Funds for the committee's appropriations and for its operating expenses were furnished by the McGregor Fund. The plan originated in 1934 and was to operate for ten years or longer. At a meeting on January 26, 1943, the committee decided to suspend the project on August 31, 1943, for the duration of the war.

We were informed by Mr. Randolph G. Adams, director, that the books on hand on August 31, 1943, will be held at the William Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan, until the end of the war or until such time as they are sold. The proceeds from any sales of books will be forwarded to the American Historical Association and added to the committee's deposit.

This concludes one of the most interesting activities of the Association. Its success has been due to the interest and devotion of the chairman, Mr. Randolph G. Adams, and his associates on the committee.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE *Annual Report*

The three following volumes, constituting the *Annual Report* for 1941, have appeared during the past year: Volume I, containing the Association's and the Pacific Coast Branch's proceedings for 1941; an account covering the fifteenth con-

ference on Latin-American history; *Private Letters from the British Embassy in Washington to the Foreign Secretary, Lord Granville, 1880-1885*, edited by Professor Paul Knaplund and Dr. Carolyn Clewes; and a list of manuscript accessions in various depositories in the United States during 1940, compiled by Mrs. Margaret S. Eliot. Volume II, entitled *Talleyrand in America as a Financial Promoter, 1794-1796: Unpublished Letters and Memoirs*, translated and edited by Hans Huth and Wilma J. Pugh. Volume III, containing a *List of Doctoral Dissertations in History now in Progress at Universities in the United States and the Dominion of Canada*, continuing the series long published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington's Division of Historical Research and more recently as a supplement to the *American Historical Review*.

No back volumes of any previous *Report* are outstanding—all *Reports* through 1941 have now been published in their entirety. With respect to the *Report* for 1942, this will consist of three volumes, as noted, all in advanced stages of manufacture: Volume I, containing the Association's and the Pacific Coast Branch's proceedings and a list of members; Volume II, containing "Letters from the Berlin Embassy, 1871-1874 and 1880-1885," edited by Paul Knaplund; Volume III, containing thirty-odd papers prepared for the last annual meeting but which were not presented because of wartime cancellation of the program and for which no other publication arrangements had been completed, edited by Stanley M. Pargellis, the Program Committee chairman. All will be ready for distribution at an early date.

The customary printing credit of \$10,620 has again been allotted for the current fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943. Volume I of the *Annual Report* for 1943 will include the customary proceedings. The "Cumulative Index to *Writings on American History*" has been expanded to embrace eight additional years, 1931-38, bringing the work more nearly up to date. The manuscript has consequently been delayed and publication cannot be undertaken at present. *Writings on American History* for 1939-40 has, however, been completed for some time and the Beveridge Committee, which has undertaken to bring out that work in the future, has been unable to find a publisher. Under the circumstances, it has been decided to publish this combined volume as Volume II of the *Annual Report* for 1943 without, however, establishing a precedent by doing so, since the Beveridge Committee has definitely assumed responsibility for the work and is currently financing the preparation of the manuscript for a combined 1941-42 volume.

The special committee, named a year ago by the Executive Secretary of the Association (Solon J. Buck, chairman; St. George L. Sioussat, Lester J. Cappon) to consider the possibility of publishing a selective bibliography of American history based upon an elaborate W.P.A. project recently completed has not as yet rendered a report.

The Publication Committee again recommends that the possibility of publishing collections of documentary material, especially in the American history field, now that it need no longer include *Writings* in its program, be made generally

known to members and that individuals be encouraged to submit edited groups of papers and the like to the committee, with a view to their acceptance for early publication. All members of the committee are resident in Washington and all have attended all meetings of the past year.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE GEORGE LOUIS BEER PRIZE

The committee on the Beer Prize received two manuscripts for consideration for this prize. (The committee has decided the award should go to Arthur M. Cook of Temple University for his study of *British Enterprise in Nigeria*.)

REPORT OF THE ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE MEMORIAL FUND COMMITTEE

This committee has continued to support the preparation of *Writings on American History* and has carried on its major program of selecting and publishing monographs in American history. The double volume of *Writings* for 1939-40, because of publication difficulties, has been returned to the Association for publication and will be printed by the Government Printing Office as Volume II of the *Annual Report* for 1943. This committee will continue to be responsible for editorial expenses incurred in preparing the material for future volumes of the *Writings*. The University of Pennsylvania Press has taken over the publication of the monograph series previously published by D. Appleton-Century Company, which was forced to give up this work because of prevailing paper shortages. Preliminary negotiations are under way with the University of Chicago Press for publishing the one remaining item from the old documentary series (J. H. Easterby [ed.], "Allston Rice Plantation Records").

The University of Pennsylvania Press expects to bring out either this winter or next spring Harry Bernstein's "Origins of Inter-American Relations, 1700-1812," and Richard Hofstadter's "Social Darwinism in the United States." Several other manuscripts have been submitted, and one, Earl S. Pomeroy's "The Territories and the United States, 1861-1890," has been approved for publication. No further manuscripts are under consideration.

The balance on hand on August 31, 1943, was \$22,658.63 as against a balance of \$19,995.52 on the similar date in 1942.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE MEMORIAL PRIZE

In February, 1943, this committee circularized the directors of graduate study in history in the various colleges and universities, the university presses, and the history reviews, inviting entries for the competition. Thirty-eight entries were received—thirty books, four manuscripts, and four reprints of journal articles. (The committee has awarded the prize to Harold Whitman Bradley of Stanford University for his volume entitled *The American Frontier in Hawaii: The Pioneers, 1789-1843*.)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE CARNEGIE REVOLVING FUND FOR PUBLICATIONS

The committee has published Grace Lee Nute's *Caesars of the Wilderness*, accepted two manuscripts (Margaret Hastings' "The Court of Common Pleas in Fifteenth Century England" and Louis C. Hunter's "An Economic and Technological History of Steamboating on the Western Waters in the Nineteenth Century"), and carefully read two other manuscripts before rejecting them during the past year. The American Council of Learned Societies had made a grant of \$1,000 for the publication of the Hunter manuscript, but due to paper shortages the regular publisher of the series cannot undertake to publish the volume. The committee is negotiating with a university press in the hope that the volume can be published before the grant expires.

The balance on hand on August 31, 1943, was \$8,315.60 as against a balance of \$9,335.00 on the similar date in 1942.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

During the past year the committee has been active and with the help of members of the Association and other public-minded friends aided in restoring \$40,000 to the appropriation of the printing funds for the State Department, with which to publish three volumes of *Foreign Relations* for 1931 and four volumes of the 1919 Paris Peace Conference. Unfortunately Volumes V and VI of the latter have been halted after reaching galley proof; Volumes VII-X are also in galley proof but their publication has not been postponed; Volumes XI and XII are in manuscript. The committee submitted the resolution referred to in the minutes of the Council (see p. 590).

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE LITTLETON-GRISWOLD FUND

The fifth volume of the series, "The Burlington Court Book of West New Jersey," will be ready for distribution before the end of the year. This volume was prepared by Mr. H. Clay Reed and Mr. George J. Miller. It is hoped that the Rhode Island volume may be published in 1944. The committee has suffered a grievous loss in the death of Chief Judge Carroll T. Bond and also in that of a member of the original committee, Professor Charles M. Andrews.

The balance on hand on August 31, 1943, was \$8,065.21 as against a balance of \$7,168.26 on the similar date in 1942.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

The notice published in the April, 1943, number of the *American Historical Review*, which requested that suggestions for the Nominating Committee should be sent to the committee through the office of the Executive Secretary of the Association, produced a total of three communications. The committee therefore proceeded to its work without being either helped or hindered by any sort of

pressure from the membership of the Association. The committee experienced no great difficulty in carrying on its work and concluded its deliberations on November 1.

It is the feeling of the chairman that this procedure has worked fairly successfully. Whether it will do so in subsequent years is perhaps another question. Certainly in some years a meeting of the committee will be almost essential. This year we found out almost at the last moment that we hardly needed to get together.

The committee feels, however, that the notice in the *Review* ought to be modified. If suggestions are really desired from the members of the Association the process should be made as simple and clear as possible. The committee feels that if there is to be a notice at all it should be accompanied by a list of the officers of the Association, a list of the officers retiring, and a list of the offices to be filled. If a brief explanation of our whole system of election could be added, so much the better. A definite statement will be needed this coming year concerning the abolition of the office of second vice president (see p. 596).

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RADIO

"The Story behind the Headlines" has continued to be a weekly feature of the National Broadcasting Company and since November has been heard at 5:30 P.M. (EWT) Saturday. This constitutes an important war activity of the Association as it deals with the historical background and development of that phase of the war news which is most prominently in the public mind at the time of the broadcast. Thanks to the generosity and the co-operation of the N.B.C. and to the tireless and conscientious work of Mr. César Saerchinger and other committee members, the talks have continued without interruption, despite evident difficulties raised by the war, and with no lowering of their high standard of scholarly accuracy and popular appeal.

REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVE ON THE NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION BOARD

At the annual meeting of the board of trustees of the National Parks Association in May no items relative to historical areas and matters were considered. There has been very little legislation regarding historical areas. The main concern of the National Parks Association during these war days is the protection of our National Parks against encroachments of war activities that would prove detrimental. The American Historical Association should be of much help to the Park Service in these matters and especially after the war when there will be a considerable demand to accord national status to many areas and plans for a more intensive use of existing areas. More emphasis should be given in our colleges and universities to historic sites as source materials of history.

REPORT OF DELEGATE TO *Social Education*

There has been no executive board meeting for *Social Education* during the past year; hence all discussions of policy have been carried on through correspond-

ence. The editor has done an admirable job in producing a magazine of usefulness and inspiration to social science teachers.

REPORT OF DELEGATE TO SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

The guide to local history has been completed and will be published as soon as conditions permit. The council upon recommendation constituted a committee to implement the preparation of a handbook on methods and assumptions in historical studies; Professor Curti is chairman of this group. The council is still interested in the problem raised in papers prepared by Professors Sorokin and Quincy Wright for the Christmas meeting in 1942, namely, "Durable Periods of Peace." A committee, headed by Professor Nichols, with Dr. Clough as executive secretary, has been organized to carry on war studies. Dr. Clough is giving full time to its problems. This committee is joining with the Committee on Records of War Administration to form a national advisory council on war history (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLIX, 251).

REPORT OF DELEGATE TO INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

The two chief problems of the International Committee are the following: (1) to maintain such activities as can be carried on under present circumstances, as an evidence of the committee's vitality and continued existence; (2) to prepare for the resumption of the active, and as nearly as possible the normal, existence of the committee at the earliest possible moment after the close of hostilities. The compilation of the *International Bibliography* for 1940 has been interrupted by the death of the distinguished editor, Marc Jaryc.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, MEN'S FACULTY CLUB, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 28, 1943, 2:30 P.M.

Present: Nellie Neilson, President; William L. Westermann, First Vice President; Arthur S. Aiton, Louis R. Gottschalk, J. Salwyn Schapiro, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Councilors; Solon J. Buck, Treasurer; Guy Stanton Ford, Executive Secretary. Also present for part of the meeting were Theodore C. Blegen and Herbert A. Kellar.

President Neilson called the meeting to order.

Upon motion the minutes of the 1942 meeting of the Council and of the annual business meeting (which had been published) and the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting on September 2, 1943 (which had been circulated), were approved without being read.

Mr. Ford summarized his report as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor.

The Council discussed the abolition of the office of second vice president. Mr. Schapiro asked why the office was being abolished. Mr. Buck explained that it was

felt that this highest honor was conferred too far in advance and there had been occasions where the second vice president never became president.

Mr. Ford recommended that Curtis Nettels be asked to replace Dexter Perkins on the Board of Editors. The Council voted its approval, with the understanding that it considered it the privilege of the Managing Editor to select his associates on the Board of Editors.

The Council recommended that Leon Fraser be nominated to succeed himself as a member of the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Schlesinger moved that Merle Curti be elected to succeed himself as one of the representatives of the Association on the Social Science Research Council. The motion was seconded and carried. Mr. Buck moved that T. R. Schellenberg be continued as the representative of the Association in the American Documentation Institute and be requested to make an annual report of its activities. (This institute provides microfilm service and is headed by Watson Davis, with headquarters in Washington. The institute attempts to bring together representatives of scientific and scholarly organizations and holds an annual meeting.) Mr. Buck recommended that the Council designate a representative of the Association for one year on the *American Year Book*, and at the end of that time he should report the connection of the Association with the *American Year Book* and the importance of the work. After consideration Thomas C. Cochran of New York University was named representative.

The following ad interim appointments of delegates were made during 1943: Retta Murphy of San Marcos, Texas, was the delegate to the inauguration of John Garland Flowers as president of Southwestern Texas State Teachers College on March 27, 1943. C. H. Moore of Ripon College was the delegate to the inauguration of Clark George Kuebler as president of Ripon College on December 7, 1943. Guy Stanton Ford was the delegate to the inauguration of Patrick Joseph McCormick as rector of Catholic University of America on November 9, 1943. Richard H. Shryock and Francis S. Philbrick were the representatives of the American Historical Association at the American Academy of Political Science meeting on April 9 and 10. Austin P. Evans of Columbia University and T. R. S. Broughton of Bryn Mawr were the liaison officers to the meeting of the School of Classical Studies in Rome. J. Salwyn Schapiro of City College, New York, represented the Association at a meeting to consider a proposal to prepare material on international affairs to be distributed to the armed services. Carl Stephenson, chairman, J. Salwyn Schapiro, and Solon J. Buck formed a subcommittee of the Council to investigate the continuation of the International Bibliography of Historical Sciences.

Mr. Theodore C. Blegen reported on the work of the Historical Service Board. This Board was established as a result of action taken by the Executive Committee on September 2, 1943, in response to a request by the Secretary of War that the Association should assume responsibility for the preparation of pamphlets on significant current problems for the War Department's educational program—specifically for soldier discussion groups.

The Board consists of the following ten members: Shepard B. Clough, Robert E. Cushman, Guy Stanton Ford, Dixon Ryan Fox, Waldo G. Leland, Edwin G. Nourse, J. Salwyn Schapiro, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Robert R. Wilson, and Donald Young. At a Board meeting held on November 27, Dr. Ford was chosen chairman.

The work of the Board was begun October 1 under the directorship of Mr. Blegen. The War Department submitted some two dozen questions resulting from a sampling of soldier interest in camps in the United States and abroad. These fell into four main groups: our allies, international affairs, national affairs, and community and personal problems. The task assumed by the Board was to prepare factual materials for these questions in the form of pamphlets to serve as the basis for "G. I. Roundtables." The completed pamphlets are to be supplied to the camps through orientation officers. Every effort is being made, with the co-operation of scholars in many fields, to prepare materials that are factual, impartial, adequate, and interesting. Two members of the Board serve as referees for each manuscript. The series will include a guide for discussion leaders.

Mr. Blegen reported that some twenty pamphlets were in course of preparation. Ten had been received and were in various stages of editing, rewriting, revision, and criticism. Two had already been submitted to the War Department. The Association is under contract to furnish the manuscripts at an average rate of three per month after December 3.

Mr. Herbert A. Kellar presented for the Committee on Historical Source Materials four memoranda on historical objects and manuscripts. The committee feels that there is a very great need for a handbook for the study of historical objects. The National Park Service is very much interested, and the committee wishes approval of the project and the permission of the Council to secure funds to prepare the handbook. The National Park Service will furnish headquarters if the money for the work is obtained, and Mr. Hans Huth is now available for the work. Mr. Leland thinks the committee has good prospects of obtaining the money, if the Council gives permission to go ahead. The publication might be issued through the National Park Service, the Association (as a Government Printing Office volume), or through a private publisher.

After discussion Mr. Schlesinger moved that the Council register its approval for the committee to go ahead and endeavor to secure the funds. The motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. Kellar went on to present three more projects: (1) compilation, editing, and publication of an annual list of accessions in various depositories; (2) preparation of a union guide to manuscript collections in depositories, for which Mr. Crittenden is willing to furnish headquarters at Raleigh, North Carolina; (3) continuation on a very modest scale of making cards for manuscripts in depositories where this has not been done: (a) where no work has been done, (b) where the Historical Records Survey did some work but did not complete the job, (c) where the depository did some work which has not been completed. Through this

project he hopes to keep the work begun by the Historical Records Survey alive until it can be taken up again on a national scale. Association approval is needed before they can go ahead with it.

The motion was made that the Association endorse the objectives of these three memoranda with respect to manuscript projects and authorize the chairman of the committee to endeavor to obtain funds to support a planning committee for these projects, the budget prepared for this planning committee to be approved by the Executive Committee before it is presented to any possible donor.

The Council approved the budget presented by the Treasurer. It had been circulated among the Executive Committee members and approved.

The Council reappointed Mr. Ford as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor (term ending August 31, 1947) and Miss Patty Washington as assistant secretary-treasurer (term ending December 31, 1946).

The question of a common publisher for all Association publications except the *Review* and the *Annual Reports* was discussed, and it was decided that this was hardly a practical suggestion at the present time as two of the committees are tied up. After the war the wisdom of printing documentary materials by old traditional methods should be reconsidered.

The Council decided that at the present time there were not enough new thesis subjects and too few inquiries to warrant a central point for registration of the titles of theses.

The Council approved the following revised resolution submitted by the Committee on Government Publications:

Be it resolved, by the American Historical Association, on behalf of its nationwide membership of scholars, teachers, writers and public-minded citizens, that an appeal be made to the officials of the Federal Government responsible for the publishing program of the Department of State that that program be expedited and expanded so that the public may receive more promptly and more fully the records of American foreign policy which are so essential to a correct understanding of the part this Nation has played, is playing, and will be called upon to play in world affairs; and, to that end, that every effort be made to bring more nearly up to date the volumes of diplomatic correspondence known as the *Foreign Relations* series, to bring out the series on the Paris Peace Conference and the Hunter Miller treaty series as promptly as possible, and to increase substantially the amount of current information and documentation of foreign policy as printed in such publications as the *Department of State Bulletin*.

The Executive Secretary is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of State and to the appropriate chairmen of the committees of the House and Senate.

Professor Schapiro made the motion that Benedetto Croce be made an honorary member of the Association. Professor Schlesinger seconded the motion. The Council voted approval.

Professor Schlesinger suggested that the Executive Committee be instructed to

keep in mind the question of honorary membership. A motion was made that a committee be set up to consider other honorary members. The Council approved this motion, and the following committee to consult in making nominations to the Council was named: Waldo G. Leland, chairman; Guy Stanton Ford, and Bernadotte Schmitt.

The Council elected the following members of the Executive Committee: Arthur M. Schlesinger, chairman; Ralph H. Gabriel, J. Salwyn Schapiro, Carl Stephenson, Solon J. Buck, Treasurer, and Guy Stanton Ford, Executive Secretary, *ex officio*.

The motion was made that the resignation from the Council submitted by Professor Benjamin B. Kendrick be accepted with regret. This motion carried.

The Council voted to accept the following roster of committees prepared by the Committee on Committees:

Committee on Committees.—Arthur S. Aiton, University of Michigan, chairman; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (*ex officio*); Robert L. Schuyler, Columbia University.

Board of Editors of the American Historical Review.—Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex, Managing Editor; A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota—term expires December, 1947; M. L. W. Laistner, Cornell University—term expires December, 1947; William E. Lunt, Haverford College—term expires December, 1946; J. G. Randall, University of Illinois—term expires December, 1945; Thad W. Riker, University of Texas—term expires December, 1948; Curtis P. Nettels, University of Wisconsin—term expires December, 1949.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.—C. W. de Kiewiet, Cornell University, chairman; V. J. Puryear, 657 D Street, Davis, California; J. Duane Squires, Colby Junior College.

Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize.—Troyer Anderson, State University of Iowa, chairman; H. N. Howard, Miami University; W. C. Langsam, Union College.

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Prize.—Earle D. Ross, Iowa State College, chairman; Lewis G. Vander Velde, University of Michigan; Constance Green, 70 Cleveland Street, Holyoke, Massachusetts.

Committee on the John H. Dunning Prize.—Charles A. Barker, Stanford University, chairman; Reginald C. McGrane, University of Cincinnati; Dan E. Clark, University of Oregon.

Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications.—Sidney R. Packard, Smith College, chairman; Caroline Robbins, Bryn Mawr College; Ray A. Billington, Smith College; Samuel H. Brockunier, jr., Wesleyan University; Raymond P. Stearns, 202 Vermont Avenue, Urbana, Illinois; Paul W. Gates, Cornell University.

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.—Richard H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Julius W. Pratt, University of Buffalo; Laura A. White, University of Wyoming.

Standing Committee on Government Publications.—Jeannette Nichols, 438 River-view Blvd., Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, chairman; Richard J. Purcell, Catholic University; Bernard Mayo, University of Virginia.

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund.—Francis S. Philbrick, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; John Dickinson, University of Pennsylvania; Leonard W. Labaree, Yale University; Richard B. Morris, College of the City of New York; Mark D. Howe, University of Buffalo; Arthur T. Vanderbilt, 744 Broad Street, Newark, New Jersey; Zechariah Chafee, jr., Harvard University; Richard L. Morton, College of William and Mary.

Committee on Radio.—Conyers Read, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Phillips Bradley, Queens College; John A. Krout, Columbia University; Walter C. Langsam, Union College; Shepard Morgan, Chase National Bank, New York; Stanley Pargellis, Newberry Library; Charles G. Proffitt, Columbia University Press; Evelyn Plummer Read, 1520 Locust Street, Philadelphia; Ralph S. Rounds, 165 Broadway, New York City; Elizabeth Y. Webb, 2811 Dumbarton Avenue, Washington, D. C.; César Saerchinger, 520 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Committee on the Publication of the Annual Report.—Lowell J. Ragatz, George Washington University, chairman; Solon J. Buck, The National Archives; Louis C. Hunter, American University; St. George L. Sioussat, Library of Congress; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (ex officio); Bernard J. Holm, University of Maryland.

Delegates of the American Historical Association.—*American Council of Learned Societies:* William Scott Ferguson, Harvard University—term expires December, 1944; Wallace Notestein, Yale University—term expires December, 1946. *International Council of Historical Sciences:* James T. Shotwell, Columbia University; Waldo G. Leland, American Council of Learned Societies. *Social Science Research Council:* Shepard B. Clough, Columbia University—term expires December, 1945; Merle E. Curti, University of Wisconsin—term expires December, 1946; Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania—term expires December, 1944. *Representatives on Social Education:* Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex; Bessie L. Pierce, University of Chicago. *Official Representative on National Parks Association Board:* B. Floyd Flickinger, Beargarden Farm, Star Route, Hanover, Virginia.

Committee on Historical Source Materials.—Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Historical Association, chairman. *Special Committee on Archives:* Emmett J. Leahy, Navy Department, chairman; Edwin A. Davis, Louisiana State University; Solon J. Buck, The National Archives; Sargent B. Child, Office of Price Administration; Charles M. Gates, University of Washington; Margaret C. Norton, Illinois State Library; Randolph W. Church, Virginia State Library. *Special Committee on Manuscripts:* Lester J. Cappon, University of Virginia, chairman; Wendell H. Stephenson, Louisiana State University;

Theodore C. Blegen, University of Minnesota; John C. L. Andreassen, W.P.A., New Orleans, Louisiana; St. George L. Sioussat, Library of Congress; Roger Shugg, University of Indiana; Whitney R. Cross, Cornell University. *Special Committee on Newspapers*: Culver H. Smith, University of Chattanooga, chairman; Allan Nevins, Columbia University; Edgar E. Robinson, Stanford University; E. Malcolm Carroll, Duke University; Adeline Barry, The National Archives. *Special Committee on Business Records*: Ralph M. Hower, Harvard University, chairman; William D. Overman, Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society; Oliver W. Holmes, The National Archives; Lewis Atherton, University of Missouri; Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky; Oliver M. Dickerson, Colorado State Teachers College; Guy Lee, The National Archives. *Special Committee on Library Holdings*: Douglas C. McMurtrie, 950 Michigan Avenue, Evanston, Illinois, chairman; Luther H. Evans, Library of Congress; Gilbert H. Doane, University of Wisconsin; A. F. Kuhlman, Vanderbilt University; James A. Barnes, Temple University; George A. Schwegmann, jr., Library of Congress. *Special Committee on Preservation and Restoration of Historical Objects*: H. E. Kahler, National Park Service, Department of Interior, Chicago, chairman; Ronald Lee, Barracks 530, 3rd Tech. School Sqd., United States Army, Lowry Field, Denver, Colorado; Russell H. Anderson, Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago; Hunter D. Farish, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia; C. C. Crittenden, North Carolina Historical Commission; Lucile O'Connor Kellar, McCormick Historical Association. *Special Committee on British Sessional Papers*: Edgar L. Erickson, Chemical Warfare Division, Camp Aberdeen, Maryland, chairman; Milton R. Gutsch, University of Texas; Warner F. Woodring, Ohio State University; Frank J. Klingberg, University of California at Los Angeles. *Research Associate*: Everett E. Edwards, Department of Agriculture.

Professor Gottschalk must be replaced on the Committee on Committees as his membership on the Council has expired. It was pointed out that, until the election of new members of the Council on the succeeding day, it would not be known who was available. It was left to the Executive Secretary to nominate someone for the approval of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Ford read Mrs. Charles M. Andrews' letter of thanks for the flowers sent at the time of Dr. Andrews' death.

The Council approved the motion that the annual meeting for 1944 be held in Chicago and that plans be made for a meeting of not less than two days. Professor W. T. Hutchinson of Chicago University was chosen as chairman of the Program Committee, and Professor Franklin Scott of Northwestern University as chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary*

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, BRINCKERHOFF THEATRE,
BARNARD COLLEGE, NEW YORK CITY,
DECEMBER 29, 1943, AT 2:30 P.M.

The annual business meeting of the American Historical Association, held in Brinckerhoff Theatre, Barnard College, was called to order by President Neilson, with approximately ninety members present.

The motion was made to approve without reading the minutes of the meeting in 1942, as they had already been printed and circulated.

Mr. Ford then read in full his report as Executive Secretary and embodied in it the essential parts of the reports from the chairmen of the various committees and the delegates and representatives of the Association to other meetings (pp. 591-93).

Mr. Buck, the Treasurer, then presented his report. The motion was made to accept the report and place it on file. Approved. (The report will be published in full in the *Annual Report, Proceedings for 1943*, Volume I.)

The motion was made and approved to adopt the amendment presented in the October issue of the *Review*, abolishing the office of second vice president as of January 1, 1945.

The nomination of Leon Fraser to continue his membership on the Board of Trustees for another term was presented, and he was re-elected by the Association.

Mr. Ford reported on behalf of the Council for the information of the Association that the following actions had been taken by the Council:

Curtis Nettels was selected to replace Dexter Perkins on the Board of Editors of the *Review*.

The following representatives of the Association have been appointed: Merle Curti, to continue as representative on the Social Science Research Council; T. R. Schellenberg, to continue as representative on the American Documentation Institute; Thomas C. Cochran, to replace Mr. Albert Bushnell Hart as representative on the corporation of the *American Year Book* for a one-year term, at the end of which time he was to report to the Association on its connection with the *Year Book* and the importance of such a connection.

It was decided that it was not feasible for the central office of the Association to be a central point for the registration of theses for the duration.

Benedetto Croce was elected as an honorary member of the Association and the following committee was named to consider possible honorary members and make recommendations to the Council: Waldo G. Leland, chairman; Guy Stanton Ford, Bernadotte Schmitt.

The Executive Secretary reported on Mr. Kellar's presentation of the projects under consideration by the Committee on Historical Source Materials (see minutes of the Council).

The following members were selected as the Executive Committee of the

Council for 1944: Arthur M. Schlesinger, chairman; Ralph H. Gabriel, J. Salwyn Schapiro, Carl Stephenson, Solon J. Buck, Treasurer, and Guy Stanton Ford, Executive Secretary, ex officio.

The Council accepted with regret the resignation of Benjamin B. Kendrick from that body.

Mr. Ford was reappointed as Executive Secretary of the Association and Managing Editor of the *American Historical Review* for a three-year period (term expires August 31, 1947), and Miss Patty W. Washington was reappointed assistant secretary-treasurer for a like three-year period (term expires December 31, 1946).

The Nominating Committee, through its chairman, Sidney R. Packard, reported that Roy F. Nichols and Robert L. Schuyler had been elected to membership on the Council, that Loren C. MacKinney and James C. Malin had been elected to membership on the Nominating Committee. The panel for officers was presented and the Secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for the following officers:

For President, William L. Westermann
For First Vice President, Carlton J. H. Hayes
For Second Vice President, Sidney B. Fay
For Treasurer, Solon J. Buck

The report of the Nominating Committee will be published in full as a part of the report of the Executive Secretary.

Mr. Theodore C. Blegen presented a report on the present status of the activities of the Historical Service Board, of which he is the director. His report was an abbreviated one, covering the same points mentioned in the minutes of the Council.

The roster of committees chosen by the Council will be published in the April issue of the *Review*.

Professor Austin P. Evans suggested that queries from servicemen with regard to reading programs be referred to a special committee which would be better able to handle the problem than could an individual. No action was taken, since the matter is evidently in the way of being handled through other agencies.

Mr. Ford reported that the 1944 meeting would be held in Chicago, with a program arranged for not less than two days. Professor W. T. Hutchinson of Chicago is chairman of the Program Committee, and Professor Franklin Scott of Northwestern is chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements.

The Executive Secretary read the revised resolution prepared by the Committee on Government Publications. It was suggested that the resolution contain also a mention of the treaty series being edited by Hunter Miller. The meeting voted to accept the resolution with this addition. The text of the resolution thus revised is included in the minutes of the Council (p. 590).

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary*

American Historical Association

SPECIAL NOTICE TO MEMBERS

In conformity with the provisions of the Constitution governing the choice of elected officers of the American Historical Association, the Nominating Committee invites members of the Association to submit by signed letter their suggestions for nominations for the offices of president, vice president, treasurer, members of the Executive Council (two to be elected), and members of the Nominating Committee (three to be elected). Members may, of course, suggest more than one name for the same office. All such suggestions are to be regarded as in the nature of advice to the Nominating Committee.

Listed below are the present officers of the Association, the elected members of the Executive Council, and the members of the Nominating Committee, with indication of the members of the Council and the Committee who are to be replaced this year. It will be noted that there is no call for nominee for second vice president, now that the office is abolished as of January 1, 1945.

Officers of the Association

President	William L. Westermann
First Vice President	Carlton J. H. Hayes
Second Vice President	Sidney B. Fay
Treasurer	Solon J. Buck

Elected Members of Executive Council

*B. B. Kendrick	(term expires 1944)
*Raymond Sontag	(term expires 1944)
Carl Stephenson	(term expires 1945)
Arthur S. Aiton	(term expires 1945)
J. S. Schapiro	(term expires 1946)
Ralph H. Gabriel	(term expires 1946)
Roy F. Nichols	(term expires 1947)
Robert L. Schuyler	(term expires 1947)

Nominating Committee

*Julius Pratt (chairman)	(term expires 1944)
*Leo Gershow	(term expires 1944)
*Frances E. Gillespie	(term expires 1944)
Loren C. MacKinney	(term expires 1945)
James C. Malin	(term expires 1945)

Letters should be mailed before July 1, 1944, and addressed to the Executive Secretary, Library of Congress Annex, Study Room 274, Washington 25, D. C., or to the chairman of the Nominating Committee, Julius Pratt, Council on Foreign Relations, 45 East 65th Street, New York City.

*Members to be replaced this year (1944). Mr. Kendrick's place represents also a present vacancy as he resigned in December, 1943.

In a perverse way the tardy appearance of the January *Review* was gratifying to the office staff of the Association. We were submerged in anxious queries about the belated appearance of the *Review*. And we were naturally pleased that it was missed. But we do wish to explain to the mystified *Review* public that the magazine was for four weeks a casualty at the bindery because of difficulty in completing its manufacture.

The Macmillan Company has reported to the Association that there are no more available copies of the October, 1943, *Review*, the large demand having exhausted the supply some months ago. The Managing Editor himself is permitted only to borrow the one jealously guarded office copy. In addition we have many unfilled requests for this issue and should greatly appreciate the turning in by members of any copies which they no longer need or want for their files.

Other Historical Activities

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be noted: nine volumes of Persian and Turkish manuscripts in Arabic script, mainly of the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries; additional photocopies of manuscripts in Spanish and Mexican archives and libraries, mainly relating to the Yucatan region in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; one volume of inscriptions in Arabic and Persian on the Taj Mahal, copied in Naskhi and Nastaliq hand and rendered in English; negative photostat of early facsimile of the "Original Draft" of the Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson, bearing notations and interlineations in the autograph of Thomas M. Randolph, with further notations on a separate sheet by John Randolph Carter; orderly book kept by members of the staffs of the Marquis de Lafayette, Enoch Poor, and Edward Hand, August 5 to September 16, 1780; one box of papers of the Chevalier Charles Guillaume Vial d'Alais, pertaining to his military services in French Guiana, 1782 to 1793; one volume of manuscript copies of records of the Society of the Cincinnati (General Society and New York State Society), 1783 to 1851; ten additional letters from William Maclay to Benjamin Rush, March 26, 1789, to July 30, 1790; nineteen papers of Jacques Pierre Brissot de Warville, *ca.* 1791; negative photostats of six letters of Thomas Jefferson, December 6, 1792, to November 22, 1824 (original manuscripts in the collections of the Library Company of Philadelphia); two additional letters from Thomas Jefferson to Benjamin Rush, April 3, 1793, and September 23, 1800; negative photostats of two letters to Benjamin Rush, from James Walker, August 10, 1800, and James W. Wallace, September 7, 1800 (original manuscripts in collections of the Library Company of Philadelphia); two additional letters from James Wilkinson to Jonathan Williams, November 16, 1800, and to Thomas Biddle, May 20, 1821; three additional letters from James

Madison to Benjamin Rush, October 23, 1809, November 6, 1810, and September 20, 1811; letter from Egbert Benson to William S. Shaw, October 20 []; one reel of negative microfilm of papers of, and relating to, Abraham Lincoln, *ca.* 1831 to 1866 and undated (original manuscripts in possession of the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery); typescript copy (from newspaper item) of letter from John Marshall to Humphrey Marshall (his cousin), Richmond, May 7, 1833; typewritten copy of letter from Francis Scott Key to Roger Brooke Taney, Washington, January 30, 1835; attested copy of resolutions of the United States Congress passed on the occasion of the death of James Madison, dated June 30, 1836; notebook of Robert Mills, with drawings, accompanied by twenty-four miscellaneous loose pieces (fragmentary manuscripts, clippings, and photograph), 1836 to 1840 and undated; microfilm and enlargement prints of fifteen papers of William Gregg, June 22, 1847, to December 28, 1865; letter from Hall J. Kelley (founder of settlements in Oregon) to N. A. Leonard, December 7, 1852, accompanied by leaflet containing related printed material, May 18, 1848, to February 7, 1849; ten letters (two are letter-press copies) of Wilhelm Christian Weitling (German-American socialist and organizer of the General Working Men's League), January 1, 1851, to July 9, 1852, and undated; one volume of journal of proceedings of the Directors of the Flushing Railroad, New York, March 9, 1852, to March 30, 1857; one volume of "Constitution & By Laws of Tansboro Native American Association," followed by minutes and accounts, December 5, 1853, to April 2, 1863, and undated; fifty-eight boxes and a portfolio of additional papers of Ellery Cory Stowell and other members of the Stowell and related families, including the Fuller and Tapley families, mainly 1860-1943 and undated; four volumes of papers of Homer Baxter Sprague, 1862 to 1917 and undated (diaries of the Civil War, letters received and printed matter of later dates); letter from F. H. Würdemann to the Postmaster General, Washington, July 24, 1876, with note by President Grant, July 27, 1876; letter from Grover Cleveland to Edward L. Heydecker and Ernest N. Perrin, October 23, 1884; letter from Theodore Roosevelt to Richard Watson Gilder, April 27, 1893; one box of additional papers of John Vance Cheney, *ca.* 1897 to 1928 and undated (mainly letters from Cheney to Jessie Sherck); letter from Rudyard Kipling to "Dear Ambo," August 23, 1902 (with typewritten copies); two letters from James Abbott McNeil Whistler, undated; five additional volumes of scrapbooks, mainly of clippings from newspapers, relating to William Howard Taft, 1905 to 1921 and undated (restricted); two boxes and a volume of additional papers of Marshall Pinckney Wilder (American humorist); two letters of Robert W. Leonard (officer in the United States Army during the Civil War and lieutenant colonel of the Twelfth New York Regiment in 1898), August 25 and October 8, 1928, and two commentaries by him, undated (one pertaining to Robert Beatson's *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain* and the other to certain military and naval events with particular reference to the history of the United

States); nine additional papers of Solomon R. Kagan, consisting of letters from or relating to medical men of distinction, October 6, 1933, to October 11, 1943; eleven volumes of typewritten manuscript with autograph corrections of "The World's Sibylline Booklets" by Joseph Benjamin Moore, 1934 and undated; four additional papers relating to Andrew Brooks Stevens Moseley (soldier and journalist of Rome, Georgia, 1843-1912), June 18, 1934, to November 2, 1943; letter from Laurence Binyon to [] Munson, June 26, 1935; typewritten draft with autograph corrections of "18 Men and a Boat," by Lieutenant Commander John Morrill, United States Navy, and Pete Martin, 1943; and three additional reels of microfilm of diaries of Arthur Crew Inman (American poet and author) (restricted).

Records relating to military affairs now constitute over a third of the records in the National Archives. They were greatly increased recently by the transfer from the Adjutant General's Office of records of the War Department and the Army, 1912-22, primarily for the period of the first World War, including general departmental files; records of the American Section of the Supreme War Council; records of the American Expeditionary Forces, among which are records of AEF General Headquarters, AEF Services of Supply Headquarters at Paris and Tours, and the First, Second, and Third Armies; and records of the Polish Relief, the North Russia, and the Mexican Punitive Expeditions. A microfilm copy of a calendar prepared by the Historical Branch of the Army War College of some 30,000 documents in the files of the War Department relating to the first World War, 1917-19, was also received. Other accessions from the department include records of Headquarters of the Departments of the Platte and the Missouri and of the Fort Omaha Quartermaster, 1866-1919; records relating to the Military Academy at West Point, 1867-1904; correspondence of the Engineer Chief's Office, 1894-1923, and maps, 1880-1942, of the Army Map Service of that office; and records of general courts martial, 1930-38. Of note among other accessions are records of the Spanish regime in Puerto Rico, 1750-1898, transferred from the Library of Congress; records of the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1789-1926; records of the Washington office of the Panama Canal, including records of the Maritime Canal Company, the Nicaragua Canal Commission, and the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1897-1901; general correspondence, 1912-25, of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department; and general files, 1914-37, of the Bureau of Prisons, Justice Department. Among a number of studies now being made at the National Archives to obtain adequate data for postwar planning is a survey of medical records of the Federal government designed to determine what types or groups of records are essential to future medical research and accordingly what should be preserved. This study is a joint venture of the Division of Medical Sciences of the National Research Council and of the National Archives and is being financed with a grant from the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation. The

survey is being conducted by personnel of the National Archives under the general direction of the Archivist. An advisory committee composed of representatives of several agencies of the government and private medical authorities, with Dr. George W. Corner of the Carnegie Institution of Washington as chairman, will make recommendations, based on the survey, to the Archivist and the National Research Council.

The Archivist of the United States has announced the appointment to the staff of Morris Kemp, formerly the director of libraries, University of Kansas City, Missouri. Hermann F. Robinton, supervisor of Public Records of the State of New York, has been designated to serve as a field consultant of the National Archives. Members of the staff who have recently been transferred to do records management or research work in other government agencies include Adeline V. Barry, Robert G. Ballentine, Robert H. Bahmer, Max Levin, George C. Reeves, and Adolph Rothman. Lewis J. Darter, jr., has recently entered on active duty in the Navy.

President Roosevelt recently presented to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library a group of papers relating to his conference with Prime Minister Winston Churchill at Quebec in August, 1943. They consist of maps, railway time schedules, itineraries, guest lists, and memoranda of arrangements and protocol. The President also furnished a number of similar items relating to his vacation on the Great Lakes from July 31 to August 8, 1943. Other papers received include a series of seven scrapbooks covering all formal and informal social functions held in the White House from March 4, 1933, to August 15, 1940. These volumes, which were compiled by the office of the chief of social entertainments of the White House, contain guest lists, invitations, cards of admission, programs, menus, place cards, seating charts, newspaper clippings, and notes and memoranda concerning the arranging of functions. The President has also given to the library a considerable number of ship models, war relics, and art and museum objects. Among them are two silhouettes of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson made from life by the great silhouettist Jean Millette. The one of Washington bears the signature of the artist and the inscription "Comm'dr Washington made at Trent'n Jersey June 1777." The one of Jefferson, made at Philadelphia in June, 1789, is also signed and inscribed. Also of special interest is an elaborately wrought jeweled sword and scabbard recently given to the President by King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia. Gifts to the library from donors other than the President include a series of twenty framed charcoal portraits of United States naval and military leaders of the present war made from life by Bernard Godwin and presented by Henry Schaffer of New York.

It has been announced that Princeton University will sponsor the publication of the writings and correspondence of Thomas Jefferson, approximating a total

of 23,000,000 words. The edition, to be published by the Princeton University Press, will approach fifty volumes, and the editing and printing of it will consume fifteen years. The Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission has approved the project. The edition, which will cost \$344,300 to prepare and print, will be partially financed by the *New York Times* as a memorial to the late Adolph S. Ochs, its publisher from 1869 until his death in 1935. The *Times* will contribute \$200,000 toward the cost of the project. Julian P. Boyd, historian to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission and librarian of Princeton University, will be editor in charge of the undertaking. He will be assisted by an advisory committee of sixteen, of which Douglas S. Freeman of Richmond, Virginia, will be chairman. Describing the magnitude of the project, Dr. Boyd said that Jefferson's correspondence, public papers, addresses, architectural drawings, and writings on a variety of topics embraced some 45,000 documents. He believes that all but a minor fraction are in existence and requested all librarians and manuscript collectors to notify him of the whereabouts of Jeffersonian items. It is hoped that readers of the *American Historical Review* will send to Mr. Boyd any information they may have about archival or manuscript collections containing Jefferson documents or items of Jefferson interest, particularly those owned privately.

The purposes of the Advisory Council on War History (see p. 251 of the January issue) have found further support in the following letter from the President to the chairman, Dr. Guy Stanton Ford:

The White House
February 17, 1944

Dear Dr. Ford:

I have learned with much interest of the organization of the Advisory Council on War History, which represents an effective association of the government's Committee on Records of War Administration, set up in the Bureau of the Budget at my request, and the non-governmental Committee on War Studies of the Social Science Research Council.

I believe that this cooperation of governmental and private agencies offers great promise for the writing of interpretive histories of the national war effort, in all its many aspects. Histories so produced will be authoritative, because they will be based on governmental records, and they will, at the same time, be independently critical and objective. Certainly it is of great importance that the American people of the war generations should have intelligible, reliable, and comprehensive accounts of their experience without the long delays and incompleteness that have been characteristic of historical writings with respect to earlier wars.

I shall be glad to further the undertaking of the Advisory Council on War History. Accordingly, I have directed the Committee on Records of War Administration to see to it that the various agencies of the Federal Government cooperate, as fully as may be compatible with security, with the historians and social scientists sponsored by the Advisory Council.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The College of William and Mary and Colonial Williamsburg are pooling their historical research resources in a broad program of research and publication through an Institute of Early American History and Culture. The results of this merger will make Williamsburg a center for the study of a wide range of work concentrated in the field of colonial history. Headquarters will be maintained in the Wren Building of the College of William and Mary. The institute will assume direction of a number of grants-in-aid to young historians in the early American field.

The 125th *Annual Report of the New York State Library* at Albany is doubly interesting because of a rich miscellany of short documents from the papers in their collection. The papers of Governor E. D. Morgan, recently acquired, yield some interesting notes from Lincoln. The British account of Bunker Hill, with its exaggerations, sounds like a communiqué from the Eastern front. It is clear that the library has replaced in part some of the great losses from the fire in 1911 by other records and printed works. The library now has over two million volumes.

The Royal Historical Society, 96 Cheyne Walk, London, S. W. 10, announces that a competition, sponsored by the David Berry Trust, will be held in 1946 for a gold medal and a prize of £50, which will be awarded to the writer of the best essay on a subject, to be selected by the candidate, dealing with Scottish history within the reigns of James I to James VI inclusive, provided such subject has been previously submitted to and approved by the council of the Royal Historical Society. All essays should reach the above address not later than October 31, 1946. Essays should be based on original materials and must not hitherto have been published or awarded any other prize. There is no limit to the essay's length. For further particulars application should be made to the secretary of the Royal Historical Society. Professor A. F. Scott Pearson was awarded the 1943 prize for his essay entitled "Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1400-1600."

The Vermont Historical Society has announced the establishment of a thousand dollar annual fellowship for the study and writing of Vermont history. The fellowship will be available immediately. Application for the 1944 scholarship, which is open to graduates of accredited colleges and universities, will be received at the office of the society.

The annual summary number of *Publishers' Weekly*, dated January 22, 1944, reads:

American publishers in 1943, facing a rapidly rising sales market, cut the number of new titles and new editions which they published by 12½ per cent and got their increases in sales by issuing larger editions. The exact result of this curtailment on the quality of the year's output cannot be accurately estimated but there seems to be no indication that important enterprises or books of scholarly character have been neglected. In fact, it has been a year when serious books have

seemed to more than hold their own. For example, the university presses have kept their output at the same level as last year.

Another characteristic of the year has been the tremendous sales of technical books (though the wartime peak of sales has passed) and while these sales have largely been quantity orders for established titles, the group of publishers of technical books has been among those which kept their output in number of new titles about the same as in previous years.

School textbooks, however, have decreased as far as the number of new titles issued is concerned, and a check of the 14 larger houses specializing in this field shows a decrease of 30 per cent compared to 1942.

The American Book Production table shows a total of 8,325 new books and new editions this year as compared to 9,525 in 1942. Fiction decreased by 185 titles, but, as all the trade knows, the size of the editions sold increased remarkably in this field. Juvenile titles dropped from 864 to 690. . . . Poetry and Drama dropped from 594 to 393 and General Literature from 400 to 301. Other decreases which are perhaps in line with what might be expected from the trend of public interest are in the fields of Games and Sports, 149 to 89; Law, 112 to 78; Business books, 261 to 146. Less expected is the decrease in the number of books on History from 646 to 539 and Travel from 259 to 215. The only marked increase in any classification comes in the field of Philosophy and Ethics from 84 to 215, although there is a slight increase in the books on Education from 215 to 256.

If the full story of the 1943 publications could be covered it would be found that a great many books planned for that year had to be held over to 1944 because of shortages of production facilities and curtailment of paper.

The Agricultural History Society held its twenty-fifth annual meeting in Washington on February 14, when the retiring president, Professor James C. Malin of the University of Kansas, read a paper on "Space and History," and Mr. Everett E. Edwards, editor of *Agricultural History*, presented attending members with a mimeographed copy of a discourse upon "Objectives for the Agricultural History Society during Its Second Twenty-five Years." Officers elected for the year 1944-45 were Dr. Arthur G. Peterson, Department of Agriculture, president; Professor Joseph C. Robert, Duke University, vice president; Mr. Charles A. Burmeister, War Food Administration, secretary-treasurer; Professor J. Orin Oliphant of Bucknell University and Professor V. Alton Moody of Iowa State College, members of the executive committee.

The following officers were re-elected at the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Oklahoma Historical Society: Robert L. Williams, president; James W. Moffitt, secretary; Grant Foreman, director of historical research.

Professor Graham H. Stuart of Stanford University has joined the Division of Research and Publication of the Department of State and will direct the preparation of the historical records of the wartime policies and operations of the Department of State. This program is designed to carry out the objectives and procedures approved by the Committee on Records of War Administration, which was appointed by the director of the Bureau of the Budget at the sug-

gestion of the President in March, 1942. Tentatively, the program may be described as follows: (1) the preparation of studies covering the department's war-time policies and operations, which for the most part will consist of written surveys and documentary appendixes; (2) a detailed study of departmental agencies that have come into existence or have been considerably modified as a result of the war; (3) an over-all survey of the organization and work of the department, which will specially note changes resulting from the war. Professor Stuart is assisted by the following staff of the Research Section of the Division: Mr. George M. Fennemore, Dr. G. M. Richardson Dougall, Miss Jean E. Fassnacht.

The main unit of the Research Section, which, *inter alia*, compiles and edits *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States*, has undergone a number of changes in its personnel since the outbreak of the war. Under Dr. E. R. Perkins, chief of the section, the present membership of the section (apart from Dr. Stuart's unit) consists of the following: Drs. M. B. Giffen, Victor J. Farrar, John Gilbert Reid, Philip M. Burnett, Gustave A. Nuermberger, James Q. Reber, Charles W. Smith, jr., William R. Willoughby, and Katharine Elizabeth Crane. On military leave from the section are Dr. James S. Beddie (lieutenant, U.S.N.R.) and Mr. John W. Foley, jr. (first lieutenant, U.S.M.C.).

Personal

Addison E. Sheldon, superintendent of the Nebraska Historical Society, died November 24, 1943, in his eighty-third year. He graduated and took his master's degree from the University of Nebraska. He received his doctor's degree from Columbia University in 1919. He had meantime been an editor and from 1906 to 1921 was head of the Legislative Reference Bureau in Lincoln. He held the position of superintendent and secretary of the State Historical Society from 1917 until his death. Dr. Sheldon had written many volumes on the history of Nebraska, the most extensive treatment appearing in three volumes in 1930. He edited the *Nebraska History Magazine* from 1917 to 1939.

Ida M. Tarbell was born in Erie County, Pennsylvania, November 5, 1857, and died in Bridgeport, Connecticut, January 6. She was a graduate of Allegheny College in 1880 and subsequently the recipient of honorary degrees from a number of institutions. At the turn of the century few names of historical writers were so well known to the general public as Miss Tarbell's. After some years on the staff of the *Chautauquan* she became associated in 1894 with *McClure's Magazine* and after 1906 was an associate editor of the *American Magazine*. Her early historical writing was embodied in brief biographies of Madame Roland, Napoleon, and Abraham Lincoln. To this she added in 1900 a two-volume life of Lincoln. It

was, however, her *History of the Standard Oil Company*, published in 1904, that gave her immediate prominence and in the long run contributed to the dissolution of that great centralized corporation. She continued her interest in the history of business and of Lincoln, on whom she wrote voluminously and in a popular style. In a somewhat different tone from the volumes on the Standard Oil Company are her biographies of business leaders such as Judge Elbert Gary (1925) and Owen D. Young (1932). To the series "History of American Life" she contributed the volume entitled *The Nationalizing of Business, 1878-1898*. She published her autobiography in 1939. In this as in her life she revealed a breadth of interest that encompassed many economic and social problems with special reference to their impact on women.

Dr. John W. Dafoe was born in Combermere, Ontario, in 1866 and died in Winnipeg on January 9. Since 1901 he had been editor in chief of the *Winnipeg Free Press*. He was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and the author of *Over the Canadian Battlefields* (1919), *Laurier: A Study in Canadian Politics* (1922), *Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times* (1931), and *Canada: An American Nation* (1934). Readers will remember his penetrating review of the four volumes of President Roosevelt's *Public Papers and Addresses* in the July, 1942, issue of the *Review* (XLVII, 907).

Edward Thomas Williams, professor emeritus of Oriental languages and literature in the University of California, died in Berkeley, January 27, in his ninetieth year. His long and useful career covered years in missionary and diplomatic service in China and as chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs in the Department of State (1914-18). Among his many published reports and studies of China, his *Short History of China* (1928) is one of the most substantial.

Lester Burrell Shippee, professor of history and chairman of the department in the University of Minnesota, died February 9 in Delray, Florida, where he had gone in the hope of some measure of relief for a serious illness. Professor Shippee was born in Rhode Island, January 28, 1879. He graduated from Brown University in 1903 and took his master's degree in 1904. In 1916 he received his doctor's degree from the same institution. In the meantime, he had taught in secondary schools and from 1910 to 1913 as professor of history and political science in Pacific University, and later, 1913-16, in Washington State College at Pullman. After a year as lecturer in Brown University, he went to the University of Minnesota, where as teacher, scholar, and administrator he grew in the respect and friendship of students and colleagues alike. Professor Shippee was at one time president of the Minnesota Historical Society and in 1933-35, president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. He was a contributor to this and other historical periodicals and to such co-operative series as "American Secretaries of State," the *Dictionary of American Biography*, and the *Dictionary of American*

History. The clarity and objective scholarship of his volume *Recent American History* have given it wide usage in successive editions. His volume on *Canadian-American Relations, 1849-74*, was commended by scholars as one of the best in the long series edited by Dr. Shotwell. One of the by-products of his wide interests was the editing of *Bishop Whipple's Southern Diary* (1937). His last contribution was a review in the preceding (January) issue of this quarterly.

Word comes that one more member of a notable group of Hispanic scholars at the University of California, Berkeley, has died. On February 10, Herbert Ingram Priestley, professor of Mexican history for more than a quarter of a century and director of the Bancroft Library, died after a long illness. In a world torn by strife and hatred the closing of one rich, gentle, and useful life will be noted by relatively few, but to that privileged minority which was associated with him, whether briefly or long, as students, colleagues, or acquaintances, the news of the passing of this teacher, scholar, and fellow-being will bring a poignant sense of sorrow and regret. Something kindly, likable, and fine has gone out of our lives. All who knew him will feel his loss, but those who knew him intimately in his classes and on the campus will miss his presence nearly as much as his immediate family. For Dr. Priestley's personality was retiring rather than aggressive, modest rather than assertive, and humorous rather than stern, but with enough human foibles to endear him to those who worked with or under him. Always an earnest teacher and an accomplished scholar whose writings have a permanent place in their fields, it is as a warm and friendly person that his memory will linger longest among those in daily or frequent contact with him. Born at Fairfield, Michigan, Dr. Priestley's parents early moved to California, where most of his life was spent. He graduated from the University of Southern California in 1900, and his career as a lifelong educator was a varied one, with experience at the primary, secondary, and university levels, both as a classroom instructor and as an administrator. He and Mrs. Priestley formed a part of that courageous band of schoolteachers who went to the Philippines in 1901 to help establish the excellent school system which that remote archipelago enjoyed during the early years of the American occupation. At Nueva Cáceres, on the island of Luzon, Dr. Priestley served as teacher and superintendent of schools for three years. His achievements as a university teacher and scholar represent a triumph over handicaps that would discourage many. Beginning his historical training at a more mature age than many involved economic hardships and with half the vision of the average man (he lost the sight of one eye early in life), he performed the meticulous tasks of research with twice the vision of the average man. His first published book, *José de Gálvez, Visitador-General of New Spain, 1765-1771* (1916), won a second Loubat Prize at Columbia University in 1918. Twenty years later his *France Overseas: A Study in Modern Imperialism* (1938), was awarded the Commonwealth Club medal. In the years between and amidst a multitude of articles,

reviews, and editorial work Dr. Priestley produced such valuable works as *The Mexican Nation: A History* (1923); *Some Mexican Problems* (with Moises Saenz) (1926); *The Luna Papers* (2 vols., 1928); *The Coming of the White Man* (1929); and *Tristan de Luna, Conquistador* (1936).

James Augustin Brown Scherer, former president of California Institute of Technology (Pasadena), died February 15, at the age of seventy-three years. Dr. Scherer, who was considered one of the country's outstanding authorities on Japan, taught in the English Imperial Government School (Saga, Japan), 1892-96. In 1898 he became professor of history, Lutheran Seminary (Charleston, South Carolina), a post that he held until 1904, when he assumed the presidency of Newberry College. He went to the presidency of the California Institute of Technology in 1908 and remained in this post until 1920. Besides many volumes on Japan, whose purpose he fathomed and denounced, Dr. Scherer wrote popular accounts of California characters and incidents. His last volume in this genre was *The Thirty-first Star* (1942). His volume *Cotton as a World Power: A Study in the Economic Interpretation of History* (1916), was a useful summary of the researches of other writers.

Dr. Mary Wilhelmine Williams, emeritus professor of history in Goucher College, died March 10 in Palo Alto, California, in her sixty-sixth year. She retired from the staff of Goucher in 1940 after twenty-five years of service. A native of California, she received all her training in Stanford University, where she took her doctor's degree in 1914. In the same year she was awarded the Justin Winsor Prize for her study of *Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815-1915*. She was the author of a biography of *Dom Pedro the Magnanimous, Second Emperor of Brazil*, and of John M. Clayton in the series on "American Secretaries of State." She was a contributor to this *Review* and to the *Dictionary of American Biography* and similar reference works. For six years, 1927-33, she was on the editorial board of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*. Dr. Williams served on the Council from 1922 to 1926. She gave time and energy to women's organizations and to movements for peace.

Professor A. C. Krey has been appointed chairman of the department of history in the University of Minnesota. He succeeds the late Professor Lester B. Shippee.

Arthur C. Cole of Western Reserve University is now professor of history at Brooklyn College.

Dr. Curtis P. Nettels of the University of Wisconsin has accepted a call to Cornell University as professor of history.

Professor André Lobanov-Rostovsky was invited to the University of Michigan for the summer, and the University of Wyoming is releasing him so that he may go.

Visiting professors to the University of Wyoming during the first summer term will be Wilma J. Pugh, Mount Holyoke College, and Carolyn Clewes, Wheaton College. Edward Everett Dale, University of Oklahoma, will be there for a week of lectures.

Professor Gordon H. McNeill of Denison University is now attached to the Historical Division of the Surgeon General's Office and is covering the history of the medical services in Alaska, 1940-44.

Roland R. De Marco, State Teachers College, Florence, Alabama, is now in the Army and stationed at Greensboro, North Carolina.

Abbot E. Smith, Waterville, Maine, lieutenant, j.g., United States Navy, is in the School of Military Government and Administration, Columbia University.

REPORT ON INDEX POLL

Recently the Managing Editor raised with the Board of Editors the question of the utility of the present index, a timely question in view of the present paper shortage. The Board of Editors were in agreement that the index should be shortened, but they felt that there should be a larger sounding of the opinion of the membership. By a random sampling of some two hundred scholars, in all types of institutions and fields of specialization, who in turn consulted their colleagues, the position of the Board is confirmed. The annual index in the July issue will follow the briefer form chosen by a large majority in the poll.